The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 30, 1888.

The Week.

THE rejection of the Fishery Treaty had been so long anticipated that the event took nobody by surprise either in this country, or in Canada, or in Great Britain. The situation is now what it was in 1870 and again in 1885, except that there is a *modus vivendi* under which fishing operations are now carried on, which, if not satisfactory to all parties, does nevertheless answer the purpose. It is in the nature of a gratuity from the other side, and is, therefore, not revocable by us. No American fisherman need take out a license if he does not want it. If he does take it, he acts voluntarily and has nothing to complain of. If he prefers to stand on his rights under the Treaty of 1818, he can do so. That is the alternative. The rejected treaty was in large part a definition of rights under the old treaty. If the Gloucester fishermen prefer law-suits to licenses, the door is open to them to make that choice. They set out to get a monopoly of the fish market. They told President Cleveland that they wanted Canadian-caught fish prohibited from entering our ports. They wanted to have fresh as well as salt fish kept out. They wanted to secure by indirection the repeal of the law, passed by a Republican Congress and approved by a Republican President, which makes fresh fish free of duty. To accomplish this they have put the peace of nations in peril, and now they have failed.

The general opinion of patriotic Americans regarding the President's recent message is well expressed by Judge Thomas M. Cooley, a lifelong Republican whose character and standing lend great weight to his words, when he says: "'The message is unquestionably a masterpiece of dignity and statesmanship. It is a document of great merit and will be likely to wield a great influence." As for the Republican politicians, there is but one word which will describe their situation: they are dumbfounded. One moment they declare that "the President has come over to our side" and "has surrendered to Republican policy"; the next, they declare that his position is untenable, and that the policy which he proposes is preposterous. As for the Republican press, its situation bespeaks the compassion of all tender-hearted men. The editors have not the slightest idea what the Senators will finally conclude to do about it, and the chances are consequently even that if they fire off their guns in either direction, they will slaughter their own friends.

On the 14th of June Mr. Sherman reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Senate unanimously passed, the following resolution:

"Resolved, by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be and is hereby requested to invite from time to time, as fit occasions may arise, negotiations with any Government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two Governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration, and be peaceably adjusted by such means."

Later on the same day Senator Riddleberger of Virginia entered a motion to reconsider. This motion has never been called up, and the resolution therefore now stands on the calendar with this motion to reconsider entered against it. The news of the passage of the resolution had no sooner reached Gloucester than the American Fishery Union broke forth in loud protests against the idea of submitting the pending dispute with Canada to arbitration, and the Republican Senators at once yielded to these protests. Now, however, that President Cleveland has proposed decisive action, in the failure of attempts to settle the trouble by negotiation, the Gloucester men come out strongly for arbitration. "The only way these vexed questions can be settled is by arbitration," says in August one of the Babsons who in June denounced the idea of arbitration as not to be thought of. Mr. Cleveland's message appears to have left the fish politicians stranded all around.

A telegram to the *Herald* from Montreal says that "a movement has been set on foot to petition the Imperial Government, in the event of the United States declaring non-intercourse, to place a nominal duty on American wheat and other grains, while admitting the produce of Canada and the other colonies free. This, it is claimed, would soon bring the United States to her knees, depriving her of her principal market, and would not injure England, while benefiting Canada; it being contended that India, Canada, and Russia could more than supply the British demand without increasing the price to the consumers. A public meeting in support of this proposal will be called in a few days." Whatever may happen or not happen between the United States and Canada, England will not adopt differential duties against any country with which she has any commercial relations at all. She maintains free trade, and accordingly scouts differential duties for her own benefit, and not for the benefit of foreigners. Least of all is she likely to put a tax on American cereals at a time when her own harvest is deficient. Nor, if she were otherwise disposed, would she be likely to forget that Canada has lately put in force protective duties against English manufactures which have caused a high degree of irritation in Parliament. Differential duties belong to the infantile period of national growth, which Great Britain has passed some time since. Non-intercourse also belongs to the infantile period. What President Cleveland has recommended is not non-intercourse, but the non-transshipment of other people's goods across our territory if they refuse to allow ours to be carried across their territory.

The Republican party promised in its national platform of 1884 to "correct the inequalities of the tariff," but instead of redeeming this promise or taking any step looking that way, it has offered every possible resistance to every attempt made in Congress to correct those inequalities. Now, what are the inequalities of the tariff? We think that most people will agree that duties of more than 100 per cent. are cases of inequality, seeing that some other duties are as low as 10 per cent. The following articles in the present tariff list are taxed 100 per cent. or more, viz.:

Articles	Duty per cent.
Castor oil	194.77
Acetate of lead	131.11
Tannic acid	196.97
Cylinder and crown glass { do. do. do. { two sizes	106.21 / 108.50
Iron and steel beams and structural iron	102.75
Steel for railway wheels and tires	101.22
Steel wire, galvanized	111.18
Wire cloth, under No. 16	100.75
do. do. galvanized	114.21
Rice, cleaned	113.03
Paddy	134.50
Peanuts	106.04

The number of articles above 70 per cent. is too numerous to mention, but we subjoin a few in the woollen schedule which may certainly be classed as "inequalities":

Woollen cloths, etc.	Duty per cent.
Valued *not above* 80 cents per pound, no matter how low (poor man's cloth)	89.84
Valued *above* 80 cents per pound, no matter how high, broadcloth, etc	68.91
Shawls, not above 80 cents per pound (poor women's shawls)	88.44
Ditto, above 80 cents	65.41
Ditto, alpaca, camel's hair, etc	61.53
Woollen goods in general, not above 80 cents per pound	88.81
Ditto, above 80 cents	64.46
Flannels, not above 30 cents per pound	73.42
Ditto, above 30 and not above 40 cents	64.46
Blankets, not above 30 cents per pound	79.66
Ditto, above 30 and not above 40 cents	63.84
Knit goods, not above 30 cents per pound	88.33
Ditto, above 30 and not above 40 cents	65.20

These discriminations against the poor and in favor of the rich are presumably some of the "inequalities of the tariff" which the Republican platform of 1884 promised to correct, but which the party is now holding on to with all its might.

A most important document connected with the present tariff discussion was published by the *Evening Post* on Wednesday of last week, viz., a comparative statement of the present rates of duty on each article and the proposed rates on the same articles in the Mills bill, all reduced to an ad-valorem basis. There has been a great demand for this information. The document is prepared by the Committee of Ways and Means. It is interesting to note that the duties on woollens remain at 40 per cent. in the Mills bill even after the repeal of the duties on the raw material, wool. That does not strike us as very alarming to the American woollen industry. Nor does the average reduction to 42.78 per cent. from the present average, 47.10 per cent., appear to warrant the paroxysms that some people have been thrown into by it. Gen. Harrison has gone so far as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to admit that this bill is not in itself dangerous. He finds the real danger to be in the state of mind of those who support it. If they support it on grounds of protection, it is all right; if not, it is all wrong. No means have been suggested by Mr. Harrison for collecting their opinions, but if all the friends of the bill could be brought together and should take their Bible oaths that they support it on protectionist grounds, we are sure that Mr. Blaine would not be satisfied, although Mr. Harrison possibly might be. Perhaps the best way to judge of the bill is by its merits, without regard to anybody else's state of mind.

Mr. Thurman's speech at Port Huron last week showed that he has lost none of his intellectual vigor, and is as well qualified, in point of age, to serve in the Vice-Presidency as is his senior by a few months, Justice Bradley of New Jersey, to sit upon the Supreme Bench. It was an admirably plain, straightforward, common-sense presentation of the issue of the campaign. The *Tribune*, we observe, editorially refers to Mr. Thurman's speeches as "demagogic" and "cheap," and therefore, of course, calculated to drive voters away from the cause he advocates. We expected, consequently, to find the full text of the Port Huron deliverance in the *Tribune's* news columns as the best way of making votes for Harrison (Harrison is the name of the candidate the *Tribune* supports, isn't it?); but, somewhat to our surprise, found only the briefest possible abstract. This is very odd.

Mr. F. B. Thurber writes a letter to the *Times* to say that he is in favor of tariff reform, and also in favor of protection, and that he intends to vote for Mr. Cleveland this year. In an interview in the *Herald* he adds that he voted against Mr. Cleveland in the last Presidential election. We call the attention of Gen. Harrison especially to Mr. Thurber, because the former has been so anxious to know the exact state of mind of Mr. Cleveland's supporters on protection in the abstract. Here is a truly representative man, one of the foremost merchants and one of the most untiring "anti-monopolists" in the United States. Probably Mr. Thurber had no intention of offering himself as an example to satisfy Gen. Harrison's curiosity, but he serves the purpose all the better for that reason. The *Press* of this city should also take courage from Mr. Thurber's letter. That stipendiary newspaper of Thursday said that "the question of the difference between a 47 per cent. 'robbery' [meaning the present tariff] and a 42 per cent. 'robbery' [meaning the Mills bill] is not worth discussing": the real gist of the controversy is whether you are for protection, adequate protection. Now, Mr. Thurber declares that he is for protection, and, of course, that must mean adequate protection, because nobody can logically say that he is in favor of protection but not in favor of adequate protection. We are glad to have the acknowledgment of the stipendiary *Press* that the difference between the present tariff and the Mills bill is not in itself worth discussing.

The farmers of the South and Southwest are taking active steps to protect themselves against the exactions of the Cotton-Bagging Trust. At Memphis a large meeting resolved that they would use no jute bagging to wrap their cotton, but would buy osnaburgs or anything else merchantable rather than submit to the extortion sought to be practised upon them. The Boston *Commercial Bulletin*, on the other hand, tells us that there is no such thing as a Cotton-Bagging Trust, but only a "corner" in cotton bagging. We presume that it is immaterial to the farmers whether the combine is technically a Trust or a corner, seeing that they lose the same amount of blood in either case. The *Bulletin's* explanation of the way the corner came about is a queer one. It says that when the Mills bill was passed, reducing the duty on bagging to ⅜ cent per pound (the former duty having been 1½ cents), the manufacturers became alarmed, notwithstanding the fact that the same bill put their raw material, jute, on the free list, the former duty having been $5 per ton. They were so much alarmed that fifteen or sixteen bagging mills shut down without waiting to see whether the Mills bill would pass the Senate and become a law or not. "These mills," says the *Bulletin*, "were hopeless of being able to manufacture in competition with the Calcutta manufacturers under the small protection afforded by the Mills bill"—that is, by a bill which has not become a law, and cannot without the approval of the Senate. Not only were these particular mills shut down, but those which kept open "ran on short time so as to be ready to close down and not be caught with large stocks if the duty should be removed." It is so much easier to stop working when you are running half time than when you are running full time. "The condition of affairs," it continues, "presented an excellent opportunity for a corner, and it was seized by a large and financially strong St. Louis firm, which owns some mills and controls the products of more, who began to quote low prices and further depressed the market. Then, in conjunction with a strong New York firm, they bought up the product of certain mills, and leased other mills until they secured control of the product of about all the mills running except one Boston mill, and had leases of all the mills not closed. From present prospects we expect to see a further advance, say to 14 or 14½ cents for two-pound bagging, as the cotton crop is large and the bagging must be bought." What impresses us most strongly in this narrative is the excellent understanding that the owners of the fifteen or sixteen closed mills must have had with the wicked but financially strong St. Louis firm, to neglect the opportunity of doing a good season's business by opening their mills and taking advantage of the great rise in the price of bagging.

"J. W. T." puts certain questions to us regarding the duty on wool, which we shall endeavor to answer. We import about 114,000,000 pounds of wool, and we produce about 265,000,000 pounds. We also import about 200,000,000 pounds in the form of woollen goods and yarns. What the free importation of wool *will do* can be best judged by what it *has done* in other countries. The English wool-growers were terribly alarmed when it was proposed to make wool free of duty in that country. But the experiment was tried, and it resulted in enormously increasing the growth of wool in England, notwithstanding the high price of land. Indeed, one of the chief complaints after the wool duties were abolished was that too great a portion of English territory was turned into sheep pasture to the detriment of the cultivators of the soil. Some people would have us believe that no sheep were grown in this country until the wisdom of Congress devised a tariff on wool. There was no duty on wool until the year 1824, and it is quite certain that wool-growing constituted as large a *proportion* of the aggregate national industries prior to that time as it has done at any time since. Again, wool was substantially made free by the tariff of 1857 without any diminution of the home-grown product. On the other hand, the enactment of the high wool and woollens tariff of 1867 was followed by a most extraordinary slaughter of sheep and decrease of home-grown wool product. The woollen manufacture was correspondingly depressed. The bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers for 1872 complains bitterly of the state of the industry "during the past five years"—that is, ever since the tariff of 1867 was passed, declaring that "it has been extremely difficult during all this time to buy wool and manufacture it into goods and get a new dollar for an old one." The same document says that the large profits made during the war had been mainly exhausted during this sad five years' period. The blow struck at the manufacturers by the wool tariff of 1867 recoiled on the wool-growers. Hence the great slaughter of sheep that ensued. Finally, let us observe, the object of human industry is to *have* wool rather than to *grow* it.

An incident in Sunday's meeting of the Central Labor Union is thus reported:

"A complaint was made that one of the highly protected manufacturers was trying to squeeze more money out of his employees. The New York Woven Wire Mattress Company, that paid lower wages than other similar concerns, had reduced the wages of its men 33⅓ per cent. The Arbitration Committee had investigated the matter, and had found that there were no just grounds for any reduction."

The duty on galvanized woven wire is 4, 4½, 5, and 5½ cents per pound, according to the sizes, and is equal to 114.21 per cent. ad valorem. That is to say, the purchaser of $100 worth of such material abroad must pay $114.21 additional for the privilege of bringing it to this country, in order to protect Labor; and of course Labor must pay the whole sum, $214.21, for the woven wire in the form of mattresses if Labor ever sleeps on one, which may be doubtful. Would it not be well to increase the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duty on woven wire in order that the domestic makers of the article may be enabled to pay wages satisfactory to the Central Labor Union?

Mr. David A. Wells has been writing a series of articles in the columns of the *Financial Chronicle*, replying to that journal's criticisms on his 'Economic Disturbances since 1873.' In this work Mr. Wells sought to account for the great decline in the prices of leading staple articles in recent years by improved facilities of production and transportation, leading to an increase of supply in the markets of the civilized world disproportionate to the increase of population in the same time. Incidentally Mr. Wells dropped a stone on the heads of the bimetallists, for if the fall of prices can be accounted for by a careful observation of what is taking place on the earth, it is a waste of one's energies to fetch from the clouds another reason, viz.: the demonetization of silver. The *Chronicle*, whose one weakness is bimetallism, sought to show that Mr. Wells's statistics and his reasoning from the same were alike erroneous. To its criticisms Mr. Wells has replied in detail, and appears to us to furnish a hard nut to crack for those who look to the amount of the circulating medium to find out what the range of prices ought to be at any given time. It is commonly held by economists that Tooke gave the *coup de grâce* to that class of opinions in his celebrated 'History of Prices.' Mr. Wells's argument is on all fours with that of Tooke, although quite independent and original.

It is a satisfaction to us to agree for once with Senator Beck on a question of national finance. His bill to repeal the Sinking-Fund Law is right and ought to pass, and for the very reasons he has given. He said: "The sinking fund is not only encouraging Trusts and combinations of bondholders to increase the premium on our bonds, but our outstanding indebtedness is in such a condition now that I can name ten men in the United States who, by combinations, can purchase all our outstanding bonds and hold them, and, under the law as it now stands, force the Secretary of the Treasury under our laws to pay $200,000,000 for every $100,000,000 of bonds he obtains from them, and he is compelled by law to buy annually over $50,000,000 of them, even if he pays 100 per cent. premium." There are good reasons to believe that the combination to corner the bond market against the Government, which Mr. Beck speaks of as possible, already exists. It would be wonderful if it did not exist, considering the necessity imposed upon the Secretary of the Treasury by the Sinking-Fund Law, and the limited amount of floating bonds in the street. If there ever was a public advertisement to form a Trust, it is that which the Sinking-Fund Law and the state of the bond market together create.

The official evidence that Pat. Ford and his brother were deserters from the army while in face of the enemy during the Rebellion, ought not to surprise anybody. It is said that Ford's political influence will be ruined by the disclosures, but they are not the worst revelations which have been made of his character and of that of his newspaper. Is it any more cowardly to desert than it is to hire fiends to take dynamite into a great city and blow up buildings without regard to innocent human lives? Ford not only did this, no longer ago than 1885, calling it a "holy war," but he publicly rejoiced over it. He raised $40,000 for a Dynamite Fund, and when in January, 1885, news came of frightful explosions in London, Ford publicly claimed credit for the diabolical work. Ford was collecting his Dynamite Fund while "supporting" Blaine in 1884; yet Blaine thanked him personally at the close of the campaign for his "strong and valuable support." His coöperation has been eagerly sought again this year. He was one of the men who came back from the Chicago Convention full of grief because Blaine was not nominated.

Ex-Mayor Grace's testimony rounds out and completes the story of Gov. Hill's disgraceful connection with the aqueduct. Former witnesses have made it clear that the Governor entered into a "deal" or conspiracy with certain Republican jobbers to put the control of the building of the aqueduct into the hands of Squire, a man whom the Governor knew to be a characterless adventurer; they have shown, also, that one of the Governor's personal campaign notes for $10,000 was paid out of the exorbitant profits which the Governor's influence had enabled a firm of contractors to make at the expense of the city taxpayers. Mr. Grace now shows that instead of $10,000 or $15,000 in such notes, Keenan said that the Governor had $30,000 in them, and that Keenan and other political workers used all their influence to get the contract for Section 12 of the aqueduct awarded to the firm whose bid was $54,000 in excess of the lowest, in order that the profits might be used to pay these notes. The contract was so awarded, and was sold out for precisely $30,000 profit. Mr. Grace puts an end to the plea of the Governor's friends, that the Governor's notes were not personal, but were for the Democratic party as an organization. He says they were for the Governor's personal campaign expenses, and he was told that if he would help in one way or another in getting them cared for, he would secure the political friendship of the Governor.

Keely, of motor fame, is justly indignant at the legal steps taken by the directors of the Keely Motor Company to compel him to disclose his secret. The directors, reflecting alike upon the shortness of life and the longevity of Keely's experiments, have bethought them that if the inventor should die in the midst of an interesting trial of the etheric sympathizer, or if he should be paralyzed by an explosion of cold vapor, or if any other of an unnumbered series of accidents should happen while he is working alone among the vibrators, the secret would be for ever lost, and their stock would at once fall about seven points and become utterly worthless. So they have exercised only common prudence in requiring him to divulge the secret which he has held so long in his own breast. But Keely is no more ready to give it up now than he was thirteen years ago. He has issued a circular to the stockholders in which he threatens to stop work immediately unless the suit is withdrawn. He tells them that his contract with the Motor Company does not include his "ultimate system," which is that of "sympathetic attraction," but only the etheric vibrator, a much inferior force. The stockholders, it is said, are much alarmed by this threat, for although the vibrator was to carry a train of cars sixty miles an hour with no other expenditure than one spoonful of water—a saving of fuel which ought to satisfy the most avaricious shareholder—yet they are justly apprehensive of a new invention which may accomplish the same result by sympathetic attraction with no water at all. We advise them by all means to turn out the litigious directors and pay any reasonable assessment to secure an interest in the new invention. The Philadelphia stockholders are said to be backing up Keely strongly. It is very evident that they know on which side their bread is buttered.

The *Économiste Français* of August 11 publishes an elaborate article, by M. René Stourm, on the Public Debt of France. The most usual estimate of the capital of the debt is said to be $6,400,000,000. The most moderate estimates place it a few millions lower. M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu figures it at $6,343,573,630. The result of M. Stourm's computation is a total of $5,902,800,000, with the qualification, however, that he has omitted $432,000,000 of life annuities, which other economists have treated as part of the capital of the debt. The annual charge for interest and sinking-fund, on the entire debt, including the life annuities, is $258,167,083. Of the funded debt, $2,900,000,000 are perpetual three per cents, $1,357,600,000 perpetual four and a half per cents, and $967,906,200 redeemable bonds of various descriptions. Annuities to divers companies and corporations, of $477,400,000, and $200,000,000 of floating debt, make up the balance of M. Stourm's total. This is by far the heaviest burden borne by any nation on the globe. The nearest approach to it is the debt of Russia, which is stated at $3,605,600,000. England is next, with $3,565,800,000, and Italy next, of European nations, with $2,226,200,000. The debt of Austria is $1,857,600,000, and of Hungary $635,600,000. Spain owes $1,208,400,000, and Prussia $962,800,000. These are the figures of M. Stourm. None of these nations, excepting England and Prussia, raises sufficient revenue to guarantee a permanent equilibrium of the budget, but France is the most heavily burdened of them all, and the increase of her debt has been the most rapid in the recent past and is the most threatening for the future.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

THE message sent to Congress by the President recommending an addition to the Retaliation Act, so that the transshipment of Canadian goods in bond across our territory may be inhibited unless Canada shall allow our fishermen to transship their catch across Canadian territory, calls attention to a glaring fault in the present Retaliation Act, and refutes the charge that the Administration, throughout the fishery dispute, has been seeking to advance British interests at the expense of American interests. The latter charge has been shown by Mr. W. L. Putnam to be absolutely false. Mr. Putnam proved by citations from the record that the present Administration, having to deal with the same problem that Gen. Grant's Administration had to deal with in 1870, and having the same class of seizure cases on hand, had exhibited far greater energy and assiduity in defending the interests of our fishermen. But the indifference of our people at large to these details is such that not one in one hundred of the voters will ever read them or care anything about them. But they can understand a single concrete fact like that stated in the President's message, namely, that the Senate, which has been rumbling for two years against Canada and Great Britain, for the entertainment of Ireland, and threatening retaliation and non-intercourse, and declaring that the fishery dispute was not a subject for treaty negotiation at all, has neglected the most important branch and the most appropriate form of retaliation all the way through. Regarded as a "move for position" merely, the President's message is worth all the speeches and reports of Messrs. Frye, Edmunds, and Hoar, and all the rhetorical exercises of Mr. Evarts, ten times over.

Regarded as a step seriously taken to secure a valuable right, the message is also weighty and important. Among all the privileges claimed by us and denied by Canada, that of transshipment in bond is the one which has the best foundation in reason. It is quite true that it was not conceded in the Treaty of 1818, under which we are now living. It is true, nevertheless, that it is the correlative of the privilege that we extend to Canada of transshipping her goods across our territory from Portland, Boston, New York, and numberless other places. There is nothing in the realm of reason or in the nature of things to distinguish fish from any other kind of portable property. You cannot in this case make fish of one and flesh of another. A long line of precedents tending that way does not suffice. The precedents only serve to show how long a bad principle may survive in spite of the amelioration of manners and the enlarging comity of nations. The privilege of transshipment is necessarily a mutual one. If we are denied the privilege as to one thing by Canada, we may rightfully deny it to her as to all things. Moreover, the denial of the right of transshipment is the appropriate mode of retaliation for that particular grievance.

The President makes mention of the inconvenience that may be suffered by citizens of the United States. There are a number of American railways engaged more or less in carrying Canadian goods in bond. Some of these earn freights on such goods all the way from the Atlantic seaboard to Manitoba. There are other American railways (the Canada Southern for example), whose earnings are derived from the carrying of American goods across Canadian territory. Both classes will be sufferers from retaliation of this sort. Both will have to thank the Senate for precipitating a crisis by rejecting a treaty which promised peace and good will to both countries.

It is too early to foretell the action of the Republican Senators in answer to the President's flank movement. If they pass a bill of the kind recommended by him, they acknowledge their laches in the past. They take their place in the rear of the procession and follow his lead. This will be a sorry exhibition to make. Even Ireland might be provoked to laughter by it. On the other hand, not to pass the bill will put them in the attitude of refusing to the President the most appropriate and effectual remedy that can be imagined to meet the most substantial grievance we have to complain of. Senators Edmunds, Sherman, and Hale gave us on Friday their opinions and comments on the President's message. Before noticing these important deliverances it is necessary to take a retrospective glance. In the first place the Retaliation Act of 1887 was in principle a reversal of all the precedents in our history applicable to non-intercourse with foreign Powers. It was likewise in conflict with the spirit of the Constitution, which, by giving the war-making power to Congress exclusively, gives to Congress the discretion of judging what steps shall be taken of a hostile character which may lead up to war, and when they shall be taken. Until the passage of this act, Congress has in all such cases assumed the responsibility, and in no case has sought to shift it upon the President. In the Retaliation Act of 1887, however, the precedents were abandoned, and the policy reversed. Instead of declaring non-intercourse upon a given state of facts, Congress authorized the President to declare it if any acts should be, or if any *had been*, committed by the Canadians to justify so grave a step. The acts which had been committed were as well known to Congress as to the President. As a matter of fact, the most objectionable of the acts complained of had been committed prior to the passage of the Act of 1887. It is plain, therefore, that Congress, to use a common illustration, was seeking to "hit it if it was a deer, and miss it if it was a calf." It was seeking to claim all the glory of retaliation if it turned out well, and to put all the blame on the President if it turned out ill. In the former case, retaliation would have been enacted by a wise and courageous Congress. In the latter, the President would have misjudged the occasion, and mistaken the kind of acts calling for so extreme a remedy. The latter charge would have acquired greater force by reason of the fact that no acts were committed by Canada after the passage of the act more objectionable than those committed before.

Now, the gravamen of Senator Edmunds's argument is, that the President had all the power necessary before he sent in this message asking for new and different powers, and that he has simply come over to the Senate's side and acknowledged that the Senate was right all the time. The President affirms that an unrepealed law of Congress authorizing the transshipment of Canadian goods in bond stands in his way. Leaving this question of fact to be settled as it may be, what, we ask, was Congress doing all those years that it did not exercise its own powers by declaring the time and measure of non-intercourse? Why did it not show the bravery and candor of the Congresses of 1808, 1809, and 1811, and perform its own duty in the spirit of the Constitution? Simply because it was engaged in a game of political fencing.

Senator Sherman, if he is correctly reported, made a greater blunder than any other who took part in the debate. He said that "if the President had based his treaty on the principles laid down in his message, there would have been no difficulty about the treaty, and it would have been ratified by a unanimous vote, because the message did assert the right of American citizens." This remarkable saying comes from one who signed a report from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which contains the solemn declaration that the subject-matter of the fisheries is not one for treaty negotiations at all! But it appears that if the President had negotiated a treaty providing that if Canada did not within a certain number of days allow our fish to be transshipped in bond across her territory, we should forbid her to transship her goods across our territory, then and in that case the fishery question would have been a good subject for treaty negotiation!

Upon the whole, the advantage lies with the President in an overwhelming degree. If serious trouble grows out of the complication, let the responsibility rest with those who have publicly declared against any negotiation whatever, and who have rejected the treaty not merely because it was in their belief a bad one, but because they would not have even a good one.

THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF THE PRESENT CAMPAIGN.

IT has long been a commonplace with political observers that the preservation of a government founded upon universal suffrage depends upon the education of the voters. No one can dispute the truth of this proposition, but if we consider what is meant by the term education, we shall find much difference of opinion. It is rather hastily assumed that education is the same thing as going to school, and it is inferred that special political instruction should be given to the children attending our common schools. To this end there have of late years been prepared a number of manuals of diluted constitutional law and primers of elementary social science, by the aid of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which it is supposed that good citizens may be produced systematically.

Unquestionably it is desirable that all citizens should be acquainted with the nature of the government under which they live, and we have no disposition to depreciate the efforts of those who attempt to give them this information. But political education is a very different matter from this. It is not acquired by committing to memory the details of governmental machinery or by learning political maxims by rote. In fact, there is little that is peculiarly political about it. It is quite as practical as business education, and as little capable of being taught in schools. It consists simply in applying reason to the constantly varying problems of legislation. It implies a natural or a developed capacity for logical investigation. So far as schooling trains the powers of observation, of generalization, and of deduction, it prepares the scholar for the intelligent discharge of political duties. Unless the common schools give this training, they do not impart a political education. As a matter of fact, a lad may be graduated with a very considerable knowledge of the features of our Government, and yet be wholly unable to pass judgment upon any act of legislation or to vote intelligently on any issue.

Altogether the most valuable political education is furnished by just such a campaign as that in which we are now engaged. A specific measure of legislation has been proposed in order to cure a particular evil—to meet a particular condition, as President Cleveland says. This measure, however, not only relates to this condition, but necessarily brings up for discussion the general scope and policy of government. It calls forth the most contradictory statements as to its immediate effects and as to its general tendency. A great many speakers and writers are engaged in beclouding the issue, and in misrepresenting the nature of the measure. A great many others are as busily engaged in refuting them, and in defining and explaining the real principles involved. The general public is, as it were, in the jury-box. It hears all the evidence, and listens to the inconsistent statements of the witnesses and the conflicting arguments of the counsel. It is placed in a position to exercise a rational judgment, and the exercise of judgment is itself an education.

No believer in popular government can contemplate the present state of affairs without exultation. For many years there has been little that was educational in our politics. The old parties had ceased to represent any distinct principles, and the old leaders were decidedly unwilling that principles should be made an issue. The Republicans declared that their candidates should be elected because their party was in power during the war, and the Democrats declared that their candidates should be elected because they were better than those of the Republicans. There was plenty of feeling developed in these contests. There were abundant appeals to hatred and revenge, to pride and prejudice and jealousy. But there was very little that appealed to the reason; that compelled voters to think and study and reason with one another. Neither the question whether one set of office-holders was better or worse than another, nor the question which of these sets would be the least treacherous in supporting civil-service reform, was interesting as a subject of rational investigation and discussion. Even the last campaign, which involved the important political question of the proper qualifications of a chief executive officer, necessarily aroused so much personal bitterness that the value of the political lesson was very much diminished.

But, thanks to the honesty and courage of the President—qualities which, in his case, rise almost to the level of genius—the political intelligence of our citizens is now furnished with a subject worthy of all its latent powers. The theory of government involved in protective tariffs is no longer to be acquiesced in. It is on the defensive, and it cannot be defended by falsehood, no matter how shamelessly proclaimed, nor by money, no matter how lavishly expended. Such means may be temporarily successful, but permanent success can be attained only by valid argument. Now that the subject has been brought before them, the mass of the people cannot long be deceived or corrupted. The issue is not of a character to arouse passion except in the breasts of protected manufacturers, and it is of a character to arouse serious thought among all who have to be careful in their expenditures. It cannot be discussed without a very considerable degree of mental exertion. Men cannot attempt to convert one another without being compelled to base their arguments upon the general principles of government, and this process is attended with permanent results. The education thus acquired is not lost; it is not a temporary possession. It will be available for future emergencies.

For many years our voters have done little but follow traditions and memories. They have blindly supported the old parties merely because they love the old party names. Many of them have never thought and never had occasion to think of the principles of popular government, and how they are to be applied and limited. But the question that is now before the American people for their decision will compel them to think on these things, and the effect of their thinking will be felt in the formation of sound habits of political reasoning. Political education of this sort is of so much value as a safeguard to our future that it would be worth purchasing at the expense of some present suffering. The defeat of the Democratic party at the coming election would be disastrous to the country, but it would be far better both for that party and for the country that it should appeal to the intelligence of the country, even if it suffer a temporary defeat, than that it should win a temporary success by avoiding that appeal.

BLAINE'S BLUNDERS.

THE speech delivered by the Greatest Living Statesman at Bangor on Thursday served formal notice upon the country that the issue of the campaign is the position of the Leader of the Party. It was wholly devoted to an effort to explain away one of the ridiculous blunders which its author made as soon as he had reached this country. Mr. Blaine began his explanation with a characteristic misstatement. We place side by side what he really said in this city, as reported in the *Tribune* of August 11, and what he now says that he said, as reported in the *Tribune* of August 24:

WHAT HE SAID.	WHAT HE SAYS HE SAID.
The wage-workers of Great Britain and Ireland, of England, Scotland, and Ireland, *the entire savings to-day that these wage-workers can draw upon in the hour of need* in that great kingdom, are not as great as lie to-night in the savings banks of Massachusetts to the credit of the wage-workers of that small State.	In a brief speech which I made in the city of New York on the day of my arrival from abroad, I remarked, as illustrating the superior condition of laboring men in the United States, that the wage-workers in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland *did not have in the savings banks of that country* as large a sum to their credit as did the wage-workers of the comparatively small State of Massachusetts in the savings banks of that State.

The original statement, it will be seen, referred to "the entire savings" of the wage-workers of Great Britain and Ireland, including, of course, the Friendly and Building Societies, which hold £52,812,281—not, as is now claimed, to the amount "in the savings banks of that country." Mr. Blaine had apparently run across the figures of the private or trustee savings banks, as they are called in Great Britain, which were by the last report £48,885,679, or $237,877,669; and, ignorantly supposing that these were the only savings institutions existing in Great Britain, and seeing that the amount fell short of the deposits in the Massachusetts savings banks, jumped to his conclusion. Since then he has found out that Great Britain has a post-office savings bank system, the deposits in which considerably exceed those in the trustee savings banks. He has referred to the article on savings banks in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' and now revises his statement as follows: "The total amount at the close of last year in both the savings and postal banks of the United Kingdom was, in round numbers, $520,000,000." The amount in the savings banks of Massachusetts at the close of last year was about $317,000,000.

Mr. Blaine thus convicts himself of having made a blunder of about two hundred million dollars, but he tries to wriggle out of it by the claim that the proportion of the total deposits made by the "wage-workers" is less in Great Britain than in Massachusetts. In order to substantiate this claim, he goes again to the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' But he does not say so. Of course not. An "intense American" consult the 'Encyclopædia Britannica'! Perish the thought. What he really did consult was "an authoritative British publication," which, however, by a remarkable coincidence, proved to read very much like a portion of the article on sav-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings banks in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' vol. 21, page 329. Not exactly like the article. No; the differences in Mr. Blaine's version are very significant. Here is the return "showing (as nearly as could be ascertained) the number of depositors belonging to various occupations, and the amount of their deposits," at a period some years back, as it actually appears in this "authoritative British publication":

	Depositors.	Deposits.	Average.
Tradesmen and their assistants, *small farmers*, clerks, mechanics and artisans not described as journeymen, and their wives	296,407	£8,144,206	£27
Domestic servants, charwomen, nurses, and laundresses	257,711	6,907,388	27
Minors having accounts in their own names, including apprentices	182,636	2,426,195	13
Laborers, farm servants, journeymen, mechanics, and their wives	152,057	4,354,080	29
Females described only as married women, widows, or spinsters	138,858	4,037,458	29
Dressmakers, milliners, shopwomen, and female artisans	24,859	580,202	23
Trust accounts (principally for minors), including all joint accounts	22,347	417,786	19
Soldiers, sailors, boatmen, fishermen, policemen, *letter-carriers, revenue officers*, pensioners, railwaymen, and their wives	21,525	739,248	34
Persons engaged in education, male and female	10,497	327,795	31
Gentlemen, persons of independent means, professional men, and their wives	20,961	579,528	28
Miscellaneous, and persons without any given description	60,289	1,304,351	23
Total	1,188,147	£29,908,237	£25

Here is the version of it given by the guileless Shepherd of the People at Bangor:

"The whole of this sum was by no means to the credit of the wage-workers of the kingdom. Under the English law, various other classes are permitted to make deposits both in the savings and postal banks. From an authoritative British publication you may learn that persons of independent means, professional men and their wives, may deposit in these institutions; so also may policemen, letter-carriers, revenue officers, pensioners, and their wives; so also may minors having accounts in their own names; so also may 'females described only as married women, widows, or spinsters'; so also may 'trust accounts' be deposited, including all joint accounts, principally for minors; so also may persons engaged in education, male and female, which includes professors in universities and colleges, and principals and teachers in all other schools."

Now observe the series of misrepresentations. "Persons of independent means, professional men and their wives, may deposit in these institutions"—the implication of the statement being that this class of depositors is an important one. In point of fact, it will be seen, it is less than 2 per cent. "So also," Mr. Blaine continues, "may policemen, letter-carriers, revenue officers, pensioners, and their wives." True, but note the omissions which he makes in reciting this class—"soldiers, sailors, boatmen, fishermen"—at the beginning, and later see how carefully the term "railway-men" is excluded. With these omitted employments, this class, it will be seen, amounts to less than 2 per cent. of all depositors, and, pray, are not "railway-men," to say nothing of the others, wage-earners? How do they live, if not by earning wages? "So also may minors having accounts in their own names." True, and why are not the savings of the youth of eighteen, nineteen, or twenty as well worth considering as those of the young man of twenty-one, twenty-two, or twenty-three? "So also may 'females described only as married women, widows, or spinsters.'" True, and do not married women, widows, and spinsters ever work for wages in Great Britain, as so many of them do in this prosperous country—say in the mills of Lewiston, Maine? "So also may 'trust accounts' be deposited, including all joint accounts, principally for minors." True, but how much does this amount to? A little over 1 per cent. "So also may persons engaged in education, male and female, which includes professors in universities and colleges, and principals and teachers in all other schools." True, but how large is this class introduced with such a flourish? Exactly 20,961 out of 1,188,147.

Mr. Blaine goes on to speculate as to what proportion the deposits of wage-workers bear to the whole. It is not officially reported, he says, but he saw a man in England who put it as low as 10 per cent., and others who put it at about 25 per cent. If he had studied the table given above, he would have seen that all his alleged informants were deceiving him. Why, the class of "domestic servants, charwomen, nurses, and laundresses," alone—and who work harder for wages than they?—number almost 25 per cent. of the whole.

Moreover, the very article in this "authoritative British publication" which Mr. Blaine consults, and accepts as far as it serves his purpose, explains in the same column that "savings banks are *institutions for the purpose of receiving small sums of money* and investing them for the benefit of the depositors at compound interest"; that "the offer of a bonus on thrift was of necessity accompanied by provisions to guard against its being used by others than the classes it was intended to encourage"; that "this was done by limiting the amount that each depositor should be permitted to pay in" to £30 a year, and a total, including interest, of £200; and that "*not 2 per cent. of the deposits, either in number or amount, are made by classes whom it may be supposed it was the intention of the Legislature to exclude.*"

In Massachusetts, on the other hand, Mr. Blaine has found an estimate that "75 per cent. of the whole amount belongs to the wage-workers of the State." If he will turn to the report of the Savings Bank Commissioners for last year, he will find that the deposits then aggregated $302,948,624, and that $131,779,298 of this amount, or nearly one-half, was in accounts exceeding $1,000—which is above the maximum that an account is allowed to reach in Great Britain.

This is the way the Greatest Living Statesman starts the Republican campaign. One long speech for his savings-bank blunder; another must be devoted to his blunder about the condition of business. How many it will take to explain away the Trusts blunder, nobody can guess.

GEN. HARRISON ON COMPETITION.

In his tariff address on August 15 at Indianapolis Gen. Harrison said:

"There are some who profess to be eager to exclude paupers and Chinese laborers, and at the same time advocate a policy that brings the American workman into competition with the products of cheap foreign labor. The disastrous effects upon our workingmen and workingwomen of competition with cheap, underpaid labor are not obviated by keeping the cheap laborer over the sea, if the product of his cheap labor is allowed free competition in our market."

This statement exhibits Gen. Harrison at his best. It is the sincere commonplace of a fair intellect equally out of touch with scientific thought and popular instincts. Its sincerity entitles it to a reply.

In the first place, it may be well to remind Gen. Harrison that the competition of those who wish to sell what we wish to buy has never been regarded with dread, even by his own leading constituents, the directors of the Trusts. The most pronounced and aggressive foes of competition have always made sharply the distinction which Gen. Harrison professes himself unable to discern. They have always been as active in bringing into our country the competition of foreign laborers as they have been in shutting out the competition of foreign labor products. As buyers of labor they have wished to buy cheap, and have imposed no restriction upon the importation of foreign labor; as the sellers of the products of labor they have wished to sell dear, and have imposed every possible restriction upon the importation of foreign labor products. The instincts of the laboring classes are finally asserting themselves in an emphatic protest against the injustice of this system. These classes are now thoroughly alive to the fact that the one commodity which they have to sell, namely, labor, is admitted free, while the commodities which they wish to buy are burdened with an extortionate taxation. If, as some of their leaders are beginning to advocate, they should turn the present system bottom side up, and admit free the commodities which they wish to buy, while absolutely shutting out the one commodity which they have to sell, they would be merely enforcing in their own interests a distinction which has always been recognized and acted upon by their employers.

Yet Gen. Harrison says that there is no distinction. The popular instinct he fails to feel; the scientific argument he fails to see. Only recently did he learn that there was any possible evil in the importation of foreign laborers. Having finally admitted this, he tries to use the admission to buttress up his traditional belief that there was every possible evil in the importation of foreign goods. The suggested parallel is interesting. The argument against unrestricted immigration has been admirably stated by Prof. R. M. Smith in the last number of the *Political*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Science Quarterly. In brief it is this: Unrestricted immigration decreases our average wealth, even though it increases our aggregate wealth. The average wealth of our citizens is $1,000 per capita, that of the immigrants not more than $100. The average well-being of our community is therefore lowered by their arrival. The question is not one of the greatest possible production of national wealth, but of its best possible distribution. The immigrants are laborers. Their presence therefore adds to the wealth of the rich, who wish to buy labor cheap, but diminishes the earnings of the poor, who are equally interested in selling their labor dear.

Turning now to the importation of foreign goods, where is the similarity? So long as the "pauper laborers" remain on the other side, no increase in our *aggregate* wealth is possible without a corresponding increase in our *average* wealth. No problem in mental arithmetic could be more simple. Yet the fact that our aggregate wealth is increased by the importation of foreign goods is as obvious as that it is increased by the importation of foreign labor. Not even so "uninstructed" an economist as Gen. Harrison could maintain that any nation would continue to send its products abroad unless that which it received in return was of greater aggregate value. Here again the question is not so much one of the greatest possible production of wealth as of its best possible distribution. The importation of foreign goods subjects to competition the rich and not the poor. The poorer classes own none of the commodities which the policy of exclusion makes dear. Yet they must buy the bulk of these commodities, and are interested in buying them untaxed. The effect of the importation of cheap goods is in every way diametrically opposite to the effect of the importation of cheap labor.

It is a fortunate circumstance that this distinction between the importation of cheap products and the importation of cheap labor is becoming as clear to the laboring classes as it always has been to their employers. Gen. Harrison's assertion that he can see no distinction will not seriously confuse matters. All over the world the clamor for protection comes entirely from the parties which represent the plutocracy. The parties which represent the poor are everywhere against it. Even the Socialists, in spite of their bias in favor of State interference, have everywhere joined hands with the Liberals in resisting protection as the worst form of indirect taxation, and indirect taxation as the chief instrument in the oppression and plundering of the masses. The workingmen may not comprehend the question of national economy involved in protection or free trade, but they do comprehend the question of personal economy involved in the taxation or non-taxation of necessities. The fear of cheap goods will not terrify them. When, therefore, Gen. Harrison offers them *protection by extortionate taxation*, and President Cleveland offers them *protection from extortionate taxation*, there is little doubt which they will choose. On this question, popular instincts are entirely in accord with scientific thought.

IMMIGRATION AND WAGES.

In a debate in the House on the 20th instant on the Chinese Immigration Bill, Mr. Dingley of Maine undertook to define the policy of the Republican party in reference to foreign immigration. "I believe," he said, "that I speak for this side of the House when I say that we have always been ready, that we are ready now, to amend or strengthen the present law prohibiting contract labor, if the President shall inform Congress that it needs amendment in order to accomplish the end sought; and that we further ask that it shall be faithfully enforced. [Applause.]" Then he went on to tell what he thought about the other kind of immigration and its effect upon the wages of our own laborers. He said:

"The logic of protection requires that it should be applied not only to the imported products of cheap labor, but also to imported labor *under contract made abroad to work at foreign cheap wages*. The sober, industrious, voluntary immigrant who comes here to improve his situation and become an American in every sense of the term, and who has entire freedom of choice after his arrival, demands and soon receives *American wages*; and their coming in such numbers as are likely to voluntarily leave old homes *will not reduce the wages of labor*."

We might simply turn Mr. Dingley over to the buffetings of Mr. Powderly, with assured confidence that Mr. Dingley would get the worst of it. But we cannot refrain from saying that Mr. Dingley's argument is delusive if not insincere. Do the importers of contract labor make contracts to pay only "foreign cheap wages"? How many new hands would they get on such terms? Of course they must offer something better than foreign cheap wages to induce them to abandon the ties of home and country, so dear to every human creature. But, continues Mr. Dingley, the voluntary immigrant "demands and soon receives American wages, and their coming in such numbers as are likely to voluntarily leave old homes will not reduce the wages of labor." The assumption here is that American wages are a fixed sum or stipend, which a voluntary immigrant is sure to get, while an imported contract laborer gets something less, namely, "foreign cheap wages." Every laboring man, whether native or foreign, imported or volunteer, knows that wages, whether high or low, are, at any given time, the quotient reached by dividing the wages-fund of that particular time by the number of laborers; and that, of the two kinds of immigrants, that one receives the higher wage who has made his bargain beforehand, knows just what he has to do, and loses no time looking for a job.

Twelve hundred immigrants per day coming hither will not reduce the wages of labor, forsooth. Mr. Dingley will never get the laboring men to believe that. Testimony taken by the English Parliamentary Commission on the "Sweating System" is directly opposed to Mr. Dingley's thesis. It has been shown, and the showing has produced an unpleasant surprise, that there is a lower deep for the East End of London than anybody a dozen years ago could have thought possible. The condition of the working classes in that metropolis has deteriorated in a marked degree within that period. The reason is that, degraded as were the English poor, there were still poorer and more degraded ones on the Continent of Europe—vast numbers of them, to whom the small wage obtainable in the East End of London was a boon and a betterment. So these poorer ones flocked to London, and, being unused to English ways and English speech, fell into the hands of middlemen or "sweaters," who took a slice off their earnings. The revelations before the Parliamentary Commission have been a train of horrors almost beyond belief. To say, as Mr. Dingley does, that "their coming in such numbers as are likely to voluntarily leave old homes will not reduce the wages of labor," is either to ignore all the facts brought out by the Commission on the Sweating System, or to assume that what has happened in England cannot, on account of the greater distance, happen here. But it is only too plain that distance has ceased to be any obstacle to immigration. Any Italian, Hungarian, Bohemian, Pole, or proscribed Russian Jew who can migrate to London can migrate to New York.

That the sweating system exists here also has been abundantly shown in the course of the investigation of the Ford Committee now in progress. Wages in cloak-making, shirt-making, and similar trades, formerly $9 to $10 per week, have been reduced to $5 by the competition of the "pauper labor of Europe" brought to our own doors and coming daily. But sweating is only one boil on a diseased body. The sweater takes advantage of the ignorance of the swarms from Castle Garden. Mr. Ammidown, President of the American Protective Tariff League, and publisher of the *Bulletin* of that organization, takes advantage of their numbers to fill his mill at Passaic with Hungarian immigrants. The *Bulletin* is filled with ejaculations addressed to workingmen on the subject of the pauper labor of Europe. Yet he has the effrontery to write a letter saying that "there is no more faithful, sober, thrifty, intelligent, and self-respecting class of operatives in the country than those same Hungarians." This may be true, although Mr. Powderly finds them of a different type in the coal regions of Pennsylvania. But the point is not whether they are sober, thrifty, and intelligent, but whether they are the *pauper labor of Europe*, that so horrifies Mr. Ammidown in his *Bulletin*.

Looking at the long string of delusions that have imposed upon the simplicity of mankind at various stages of the world's history, there is none more amazing than the idea that a man who is actually employing the pauper labor of Europe in his own factory, and using every exertion to get labor at the lowest sale—such men as Ammidown and Carnegie and the rest, for they are all alike in this regard—is really concerned lest the pauper labor of Europe shall reduce the wages of American workmen. These men subscribe for newspapers like the *Press*, to be sent gratis to their operatives, or to such of them as can read English, telling them that their wages will be reduced by European competition if the Mills bill becomes a law.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet their wages *are* reduced every time it suits these employers to hire a fresh lot of hands from the Old World. Instead of giving heed to such barefaced lies, the workmen ought to twist these newspapers into a gag for the mouth of every protectionist orator or colporteur who shows himself inside their shops.

Nobody blames Mr. Ammidown and Mr. Carnegie or even the Trusts and Combines for employing the cheapest labor they can find. Manufacturing cannot be conducted on eleemosynary principles. A certain amount of philanthropy may be mixed with it on condition that the philanthropy is strictly subordinate to the business. No reasonable complaint can be made if the philanthropy is left out altogether. It is one of the necessities of the manufacturer that he should employ the cheapest labor that can be had, lest he be undersold by others and driven out of business. All that we can ask is, that in leaving out philanthropy he shall leave out hypocrisy also, and not pretend that he is solicitous to secure high wages to his workmen when he is, and necessarily must be, seeking the very opposite.

ENGLISH RAILWAY LEGISLATION.

FOR the past three sessions a contest concerning railroad regulation has been going on in Parliament not unlike that which we ourselves have recently seen in Congress. To understand what has been done we must look back over the general history of English railroad legislation, and see how the conditions in that country have differed from our own.

England has never had the liberty of railroad construction which has been allowed in this country. Each road required a special charter, given only after strict investigation. Such charters originally contained long sets of provisions with regard to rates and fares, modelled on the old canal tolls, but much more complicated. At first the whole matter was treated independently in each charter. In 1845, by the Clauses Consolidation Act, a general form was established, which was only altered where the special necessities of any particular case demanded it.

All the English railroads were thus limited to maximum rates of fare and freight; but the majority of these maxima proved of no effect, because the railroads were able to do their work at so much lower rates than had been anticipated. They could thus carry their charges almost indefinitely within the legal maxima, and produce all the evils of uncontrolled discrimination. After one or two premature efforts by Parliament to establish a Railway Commission, the courts were directed to deal with this matter by an important act in 1854, which forbade all preferences. This soon put a stop to the worst forms of personal discrimination; but it left local differences untouched. These differences were specially hard to deal with in England, because of the number of stations whose railroad traffic was directly subject to water competition. Such is the extent of English coast line, of navigable rivers and canals, that, according to the estimate of a recent Parliamentary committee, two-fifths of the stations in the kingdom are affected in this way.

So great were these difficulties that nothing positive was done till 1873. The "Regulation of Railways Act" of that year provided for the establishment of a Railway Commission of three members, who should possess the special qualifications which would enable them to take cognizance of cases which the courts had been unwilling to consider. The experiment was far from being as successful as had been hoped. The Commission had at once too much authority and too little. It was empowered to decide a great many things, but was not given sufficient power to enforce its decisions. The railroads resisted its authority, the courts sometimes sided with the railroads, and during its whole existence it has accomplished little in the way of settlement of disputed questions.

There has been a growing demand for additional legislation which should strengthen the public control over railroads, especially in the matter of local discrimination. A moderate bill was brought forward in 1886; another of the same general character, but pretty obviously influenced by our own Inter-State Commerce Act, was introduced by the present Government in 1887. This has been gradually amended in the direction of greater stringency on some points and greater vagueness on others. On the whole, the English law seems much stricter than ours, but it is impossible to speak with confidence on this point, because many important sections are so worded as to be uncertain in their effects.

Of this character is that part of the act corresponding to our "long-and-short-haul clause." It forbids charging more for a shorter than for a longer distance for the same service. It is so loosely drawn that some people think that it demands equal mileage rates—a system which could not be enforced without disaster. It does not contain the limiting clause that the shorter shall be included within the longer distance—an omission which will make it much more difficult to apply.

The most specific provision under this head is one which prohibits preferential rates for foreign merchandise. This clause was not in the original bill. It was inserted through the influence of the agricultural interest in the House of Lords. The state of things which gave rise to this legislation has been somewhat peculiar. In order to share in supplying the London market with American beef, the railroads from Liverpool or Glasgow have been compelled to make a combined water and rail rate which should be as low as the direct water rate from New York to London. This left the railroads a very small margin above operating expenses; and they could not possibly apply such rates to their whole traffic. The effect of this clause probably will be to cause more shipments of American products to London direct, instead of via Liverpool or Glasgow. There will be a similar effect on the traffic from Continental Europe. It remains to be seen whether the chief expense of the change will be borne by producers or by consumers.

The Commission is continued, but its composition has been somewhat changed. It is to consist of two "appointed" and three ex-officio members. One of the latter is a judge nominated by the Lord Chancellor in England, the others by the corresponding authorities in Scotland and Ireland. Each judicial member acts as chairman for cases which arise in his kingdom, and is assisted by the two appointed members; his authority on questions of law is nominally final, but is, in fact, a good deal limited, because his colleagues have an equal voice in deciding just what is a question of law as distinct from one of fact.

The motives for this arrangement are clear. So much trouble arose from conflicts between the Commissioners and the courts under the Act of 1873 that it was thought wise to bring the new Commission into closer relations with the judiciary of the three kingdoms. But the wisdom of the plan adopted is not so clear. More may be lost than is gained. The law is extremely vague; the right to interpret it is practically given to three distinct judges for three different parts of the country. If the views of these judges are not wholly in harmony, the development of a body of railroad-commission law, such as we have seen in America within the last year, will be quite impossible.

To make matters worse, the Commission is not the only body which is given independent power under the act. The Board of Trade has, under the "maximum clauses" of the charters, always had a certain nominal power over classifications and rates; it is proposed to make that power a real one. In other words, the judicial and administrative powers of our own Commission are separated; the former is given, with various additions, to the Railway Commissioners, the latter to the Board of Trade. But such a separation could be carried out only on condition that the powers of the Board of Trade were accurately defined. The act conspicuously fails to do this. It leaves the Board such a wide discretion in determining what are reasonable rates that they must, if they use their powers at all, be forced to exercise judicial functions. It was in this way that the judicial authority of the Inter-State Commerce Commission took its rise. But if anything of the kind happens in England, there will at once be a conflict of authority. It is this lack of unity in the means of enforcement which seems to us the most vital defect of the English law in its present form. We do not believe that it will seriously injure the railroads, as such a thing would do in this country; but we fear that it will retard the development of a sound and practical law on railroad transportation.

THE BETRAYER OF LA SALLE.

SANTA FÉ, August 13, 1888.

THE fate of the men who, in 1687, conspired against Robert Cavelier de la Salle, and finally murdered him, has been told by Mr. Francis Parkman, as far as the murderers proper,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Duhaut and Liotot, are concerned. Of their main accomplice, L'Archevêque, only so much was known (as Mr. Parkman has had the kindness to inform me), viz., that he and another companion in crime, the sailor Grollet, were captured by Alonzo de Leon in Texas two years after La Salle's death, and probably sent to Spain. What afterwards became of them had not been ascertained.

Two months ago, while searching the archives of the Pueblo of Ka-Po or Santa Clara (New Mexico) for documents of historical import, in behalf of the Hemenway Southwestern Archæological Expedition, my attention was drawn, among others, to the great number of manuscripts called in Spanish *Diligencias matrimoniales*. They are investigations made on the petition of parties applying for license to marry, and consist in the main of the application of him or her, and of the examination of witnesses in regard to the standing of the applicants, their relations to each other, etc. Among these I found at Santa Clara one headed: "Ynformacion de Pedro Meusnier, francés.—1699." The fact that a Frenchman should be found in New Mexico at such an early date, and in face of the stringent laws of Spain against the admittance of foreigners into the colonies, appeared interesting. My interest soon increased upon discovering that Meusnier had come over to America in the fleet commanded by "Monsieur de La Sala" in 1684. This is testified to by two witnesses, one of whom signs himself Juan de Archeueque, while the other, rather illiterate, has not signed, but states in his deposition that he is a native of La Rochelle, and his name is given as "Santiago Groslee." Both these witnesses claim to have come over with Meusnier in the same fleet, and in the year 1684 also. Both Meusnier and Archeueque were in 1699 soldiers of the garrison of Santa Fé; Groslee was a resident of that town.

There was only one L'Archevêque in La Salle's ill-fated expedition, and the evidence seemed quite conclusive that this was the one whose signature I had before me at Santa Clara. Mr. Parkman, to whom I communicated the fact, also inclined to the belief that he was the fellow who enticed La Salle into the fatal snare, while Groslee seemed to be Grollet the sailor. I have since found the latter as Grolle and Groli in two official documents now in my possession. As late as 1705 he was a resident of the little town of Bernalillo, on the Rio Grande. Of Meusnier I have not been able to find any further trace as yet.

But the chief interest to me rested in the person of L'Archevêque, the more so since there is to-day in New Mexico a family calling themselves Archibeque, and of whom it is surmised, at least, that they are of French descent. Furthermore, I had met, in documents antedating 1720, the name and declarations of a Capt. Juan de Archiveque. It was but natural to suspect that the Captain of the War Councils of 1715 and of 1720 was the same man as the private soldier of 1699; the more so since at the latter council, where the project of the ill-fated reconnoissance to the Arkansas River was discussed, the said Capt. Archibeque strongly recommended it, alleging in its favor, among other reasons, that it would procure definite information in regard to "his countrymen the French."

Researches at the archives of the U. S. Surveyor-General's office at Santa Fé brought to light documents which impart valuable information. There is in the first place a transfer to Juan de Archibeque, "a soldier," of certain real estate in Santa Fé, in the year 1701. Lastly, there is "the Inventory of the goods and chattels of the Captain Juan de Archibeque, a Frenchman," bearing date 1720. From this manuscript we gather that our man accompanied the expedition to the Arkansas which he had so strongly advocated, and that he, with some forty-three other Spaniards, was killed there by the Pawnee Indians on the 17th of August of the same year. This, by the way, is the expedition to which Mr. Shea refers in his 'Peñalosa.' The official investigation held at Mexico in regard to it is also in my possession.

We further gather that Archibeque was twice married, and left two legitimate and two illegitimate children; that after leaving the military service he became a successful trader, extending his trading tours into Sonora, and sometimes buying directly at the City of Mexico. His estate, after settlement, yielded 6,118 pesos to the heirs, an amount quite respectable for the time. Upon a second visit to Santa Clara I found there at last the *Diligencia matrimonial* of l'Archeueque *alias* Archibeque. It bears date 1697, and his (first) wife was the widow of Thomas de Ytta, murdered in 1694 near Zacatecas by a mulatto. She herself was a native of Tezcuco, in the valley of Mexico.

The life of him who served as decoy to the murderers of the great French pioneer becomes thus sketched almost in full: Jean l'Archevêque was born at Bayonne in France in 1671 or '72, and came over to America when only twelve or thirteen years of age. When he played the odious rôle on the bank of the little creek in Texas, he was a boy of sixteen. This indicates precocious depravity, or, perhaps, to be charitable, boyish ignorance. He was picked up by the Spaniards among Indians in 1689. Of the eight years following I have as yet no information, but I have no doubt of finding documents which will shed light on that period. In 1696 he appears as a soldier of the "Presidio" of Santa Fé, and claims the hand of the widow of a murdered man. One year later, when sufficient proof is at last furnished that Thomas de Ytta is really dead, he gets married. In 1701 he becomes property-holder at Santa Fé, afterwards a successful trader and a respected and experienced "capitan." As such he foments an expedition whose indirect purpose is against his own countrymen, and in the course of that expedition he is killed—a strange and wild career, worthy of its beginnings upon American soil. His son, Miguel de Archibeque, was, as far as I can determine, the ancestor of the present family of that name.

It is noteworthy that L'Archevêque was the youngest of the three Frenchmen implicated in La Salle's murder who turned up in New Mexico. Grollet was his senior by at least seven years, and Meusnier was one year older than L'Archevêque. The former was, as already stated, a native of La Rochelle, and Meusnier a Parisian.

AD. F. BANDELIER.

IRISH AFFAIRS.

DUBLIN, August 12, 1888.

THE "Members of Parliament (Charges and Allegations) Bill," called by many Unionists the "Parnell Commission Bill," and by many Home Rulers the "*Times* Forgery Bill," passed the House of Lords last night. Everything connected with this bill is unfortunate for the relations between England and Ireland—the circumstances which gave it birth, the angry passions that have been aroused during its discussion, the unsettlement and bad feeling certain to exist during the inevitably long sittings of the Commission. The Commission constituted under the bill is not to try whether Mr. Parnell and his party are accessory to murder and outrage, but to show that they have not always borne themselves regarding murder and outrage, and acted in relation to the law, as the plethoric English middle and jingo classes say men should invariably act—as they claim they would themselves act under all circumstances.

The present Irish movement had its rise ten years ago. It was the outcome of Irish history, of an intolerable agrarian system, and, more than is generally supposed, of the treatment of the Fenian prisoners. It was led by Mr. Parnell and several other young men, some of them almost lads, most of them directly sons of the people, with only a village education, often with the narrowest views of life, imbued with deep hatred of England and the English. Those who have studied the history of political thought in England during the present century know how bitter at times has been political feeling there; they must know something of what was said and done, and must have tried to imagine what they themselves would have said and done and left unsaid in certain circumstances. In this Irish struggle there has been like bitterness, and there has been involved a national question, a class question almost comparable to that of your Southern planters, and a rancorous hopelessness such as English political contests have never known.

Mr. Parnell has welded together the extreme and discordant elements of Irish thought and action at home and abroad by recognizing the central possibilities of union in all, by never denouncing or ostracizing, by letting others pursue their different orbits, secure, in his own powers of attraction, that all would converge to him. I have known direct private appeals made to him to silence or modify the extreme proceedings and utterances of certain of his followers, and his reply has invariably been: "No; it is natural they should think and act so; leave them to themselves and they will unconsciously moderate." Had Parnell done as O'Connell or Butt did in like circumstances, his party would long ago have collapsed. He has brought the Irish people to believe as they never before believed in constitutional agitation. There was a time, before the discovery of dynamite, when they believed in little but "Greek fire," or shooting from behind a hedge. I can well remember when Irish national poetry and feeling breathed only a spirit of hatred towards England; and later when the mass of our people manifested their nationality by marching to the chorus of "We'll pull down the alien rag in our own beloved, dearest island home." All is now changed; Englishmen are the most popular speakers in Irish national assemblies, our leaders address ten words to English audiences for one they address to Irish, the centre of interest has changed from the hedgerow and the dusty, noisy popular gathering to Westminster, and the Irish people with perfect equanimity hear their representatives discussing the terms upon which a lasting and permanent union is to be effected with their once hated neighbors.

Is all that has been gained during the past ten years to be cancelled? This question of Irish outrage is an awful one, concerning which it is difficult to be entirely candid. Mr. Parnell and his party never knowingly compassed or encouraged murder and outrage. But when men believe, as most of us believed, that murder and outrage were a sure consequence of the mental condition in which affairs had placed us, and when men believe, as most of us believed after the calamitous experience of a generation and the sad knowledge of history, that nothing but murder and outrage would arouse English attention to our wrongs—well, human nature is fallible; few of us live entirely in ac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cordance with the dictates of the Sermon on the Mount. I often shudder at the state of mind prevalent during the Forster régime. One of the best and most useful citizens I know, a Protestant, occupying a leading mercantile position, instant in good works, once said in my hearing: "Don't you know that if Forster had been then assassinated, we should all have rejoiced, as our opponents would now rejoice if Parnell were assassinated?" The murders of 1882, and such events as the boycotting of the Curtin family, were, I think, a terrible awakening. Age and experience had begun to do their work. In these murders, as in a mirror, were shown the inevitable results of a certain state of feeling in Ireland. And I believe the present agitation would then have been largely abandoned by the present leaders, had they not begun to see that the English people were becoming convinced, and that the desired end could be gained by influencing English opinion. Mr. Parnell, so far as I can recollect, has addressed no outdoor Irish audience since 1882.

This Commission is a superb piece of tactics, so far as passing party purposes are concerned; but it is a lamentable blunder as to the relations between England and Ireland. Were half the implications and charges which the most rancorous Liberal Unionists make true, they would still be better ignored. The Irish Parliamentary party are the ambassadors of a people. There is nothing they have done or said, nothing they could do or say, that would not be understood and excused (because understood) by the Irish nation. Some settlement may be postponed—surely Mr. Balfour does not propose to substitute his policy for a settlement. Mr. Parnell and his party form a body of men matured and rendered reasonable by suffering and experience, who can bind by agreement the Irish people as few leaders could have bound them in the past, and as it would be long in the future before another Irish party could be got together to bind them. The Commission can decide nothing. If the Parnellites come out of it like driven snow, that will not alter the question of union (or disunion, as Mr. Dicey and the logical exponents of the Liberal Unionists would put it). If the Commission on the whole declare against them, both Liberals and Nationalists will remember that it was a commission constituted and chosen for a party purpose, regarding whose details and scope of inquiry all important attentions suggested by the accused parties and their friends were vigorously negatived.

There is much less definiteness in Irish politics at present than there has been for some years. To some extent, affairs are in solution again, and we cannot tell what may result. The suspense is weary, at times nearly intolerable. Still, it may be all for the best—better than a hasty settlement years ago. It is as well, perhaps, that the present system should be fully tested. There is less talk on the subject (out of the newspapers) than there used to be, because everything has been said, every one who has a mind to make up has made it up, and we have become used to the severing of old friendships and to the avoidance of political discussion in mixed companies. Although no Government in Ireland was ever more intelligently hated, the mass of our people are, I think, for the time somewhat tired of fierce political agitation, so far as it does not seem to concern their immediate interests and amusements. Lately I heard a Nationalist railway official complain that on his line one Sunday, when there were cheap trips to a foot-ball match and to a political gathering, the former was crowded and the latter neglected. The continued migration of the healthiest and best of our populace to your shores has, to say the least, a quieting effect. The Registrar-General's return shows, as usual, a steady decline in our population within the last year. When a maid-servant went yesterday from my house to pay a visit in one of the most contented and prosperous agricultural portions of Ireland, I expressed a hope that she would have a pleasant time, and perhaps some dancing. "Oh no! that was not likely. Most of the young people of the neighborhood had gone to America." I can recognize in popular feeling more tendency to urge individual, class, and trade interests than there was a few years ago—less willingness to merge everything in one supreme political struggle. This is good, in so far as it may remove from the path of future legislators under home rule the fearful difficulty of satisfying a people imbued with the belief that legislation is omnipotent to produce individual happiness and general prosperity. The Papal brief, whatever may be said to the contrary, is patently having a sedative effect. The "nevers" and "for evers" of the leaders on both sides are as loud as ever, but a spirit of compromise is in the air.

Surely some better way of settling public questions than by party will yet be evolved. At times the political atmosphere is almost insufferable, and one feels the almost uselessness of reading newspapers on either side or listening to the utterances of public men (Mr. Morley, in many respects, excepted). They afford no light on a given state of things and given facts. Such a party such an opinion, seems the rule.

Whatever truth there may be in the foregoing considerations, certain facts appear to me evident regarding Ireland. (1.) It is impossible that the present contemptuous bureaucracy can be permanently maintained despite the general public opinion of the country. Even if we Irish were all unreliable, thievish liars, in order to obtain any peace we must somehow be made to govern ourselves and suffer for our own shortcomings. (2.) Nothing can permanently shake the confidence of the Irish people in their Parliamentary party, and nothing can satisfy them but some form of responsible national life.

—Since writing the foregoing, the interest of the situation has been intensified by the announcement that Mr. Parnell has taken action against the *Times* in the Scotch courts. The proceedings there and before the Commission will be followed with breathless interest.

I cannot but regard as a sign of the times a letter which Mr. Davitt has just published concerning distress in the islands of Arran and elsewhere in the west. He cites the wealth and power of the Catholic Church in Ireland:

"In a portion of one archdiocese over £70,000 have been collected and expended for building purposes within a period of ten years. A memorial church is now being built to O'Connell in an impoverished locality at a cost of £25,000. A bazaar recently held in Dublin (for what precise object the public scarcely knew) realized over £4,000. Costly churches and convents can be erected, even in the poorest districts of the country, with comparative ease, while kindred works in support of religion are constantly going on all over Ireland."

He then goes on to ask whether "the preservation of a people in the land where they have imbibed their faith, is not a work worthy of the attention of the Church to which they belong," and whether it might not be well if the Church turned its resources more towards improving the material condition of the people. No popular Nationalist Catholic leader would have thus publicly expressed himself some years ago.

D. B.

MORE REVELATIONS OF BENJAMIN CONSTANT.

PARIS, August 18.

THE papers of Benjamin Constant were left in 1835 to the Public Library of Geneva by his cousin, Charles Constant de Rebecque, with the proviso that they should not be communicated to the public under thirty years—that is to say, before 1865. The family asked the tribunal of Geneva for a further delay, but the tribunal only consented to extend the interdiction till 1867. M. Crépet was therefore able to publish, in a review which exists no longer, the *Revue Nationale*, two articles on Benjamin, which were full of new documents; but he was very cautious in his selection, and there were, besides, some papers of Constant's which he did not see. The letters of the famous orator to his aunt, the Countess of Nassau, had been quite forgotten in a trunk, where they were only found in 1884. M. Dufour, the librarian of Geneva, has but lately made a complete inventory of the letters and papers of Benjamin Constant. Some of these letters have been published lately in Italy, where they created a great sensation, and we have now before us, in the shape of a volume, a selection of the most important among the four hundred which are kept at Geneva.

We must say something first of the ordinary correspondents of Constant. His family was of French origin; the Constants de Rebecque lived in the province of Artois, in the north of France. After the religious wars, they settled in Switzerland; one of them, the Baron de Constant, was a friend of Voltaire's. He lived at Lausanne, which then possessed a brilliant aristocracy, whose members took service in the armies of France and Holland. Voltaire saw much of Samuel de Constant, who was a young and handsome man; and we find in the 'Vie intime de Voltaire aux Délices et à Ferney,' published by Lucien Perey and Gaston Maugras, that notwithstanding her forty-seven years, the niece of Voltaire, the inflammable Mme. Denis, fell in love with the young Constant. He married, however, Charlotte Pictet, and had four children, one of whom left the Constant papers to the library of Geneva.

Rosalie, the eldest daughter, became one of the principal correspondents of Benjamin Constant, who was her first cousin. Benjamin was the son of Juste de Constant (not of Samuel, as some biographers have said); his mother died when he was born; at the age of seven he was sent to Holland with a preceptor. He was a brilliant child—so much so that his family kept his letters. He lost at an early age his grandmother, and her place near him was taken by his aunt, Mlle. de Chandieu, who had married a Count of Nassau, but had almost immediately separated from him. Mme. de Nassau became a second mother to young Benjamin. Two persons, Rosalie de Constant, his first cousin, who never married, and his aunt, Mme. de Nassau, remained during his whole life his best friends and advisers.

We will not relate here the history of Constant. He was very wild and eccentric in his youth; he was also clever and intelligent, as his first letters show. The collection of those to his family begins as far back as 1775. While he was still very young, he married a lady-in-waiting of the Duchess of Brunswick; the marriage was not a happy one, and Constant was divorced from his wife, as well as from his post of Chamberlain at Brunswick. It was on the 19th of September, 1794, that Benjamin Constant was presented to Mme. de Staël, who was well acquainted with the members of the Constant family, and who was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already much admired at Lausanne for her extraordinary genius. The cousin Rosalie said at once, speaking of Mme. de Staël and Benjamin: "She is stronger than he." This first meeting was the beginning of a *liaison*, to use the French word, which lasted fifteen years, and whose incidents are the most dramatic part of the correspondence which is before us.

The passion of Mme. de Staël and of Benjamin Constant was extremely stormy. We find them together at first in 1795, not far from Paris. He has espoused all the ideas of Mme. de Staël; he writes to his uncle: "I have the best hopes of the destinies of the Republic." Mme. de Staël writes at the same moment some "Reflections on the Peace of the Interior." They both think that France will find her way "between despotism and anarchy." In 1796, after fighting a duel with a journalist in Paris (a bloodless duel, which, however, put Mme. de Staël almost beside herself), Constant joined her at Lausanne. Here is a curious account of a visit of Rosalie Constant to Mme. de Staël:

"I have seen two or three times my cousin Staël and my cousin *le tondu* [Benjamin, who had cut his hair, in the revolutionary fashion]. The day before yesterday I made them a visit. I found her between the fox [M. de Tracy], the kitten [Adrien de Meun], and the other [Benjamin], having one of her elbows on the breast of one and taking another by the head, while the third one held her by the neck and called her 'good little cat.' This picture somewhat disgusted me."

Cousin Rosalie admired the genius of Mme. de Staël, but did not admire her manners, and she felt very sorry that Benjamin should be completely under her sway. In 1796 Constant published a pamphlet under the title 'On the Strength of the Present Government and the Necessity of Rallying to it.' Two thousand copies were sold in a fortnight, and a second edition was issued in 1797. Mme. de Staël became, in 1797, the mother of a daughter, Albertine de Staël, who afterwards became the Duchesse de Broglie. Benjamin Constant was intimately acquainted with the Director Barras, and confessed in his letters being under many obligations to him. Though he wrote on the necessity of supporting the Republican Government, he had not many illusions as to its vitality; he wrote to his aunt: "The Government has not a sou; the negotiations with the Empire and with England are on the point of being broken off; those who buy the *biens nationaux* [the confiscated property of the *émigrés*] are assassinated every day; the country people are fanatical; the patriots are calumniated in the most horrible manner."

He was living at that moment at Hérivaux, on the edge of the great Chantilly forest, in a most quiet and deserted place, where he is still remembered, though he only remained in it two years. Mme. de Staël made him long visits, and he made long visits to Paris. In 1799 Benjamin Constant was appointed a member of the Tribunate. Mme. de Staël and he were now completely before the world. In 1802 M. de Staël died, and it has often been disputed whether Mme. de Staël, who was now free, entertained or not the idea of a marriage with Constant. The publisher of his letters to his family thinks that Constant himself did not wish to marry Mme. de Staël, and that his sister Rosalie was the only member of the Constant family who desired it; she writes to her brother: "You know the romantic story of M. de Staël. Benjamin must be at Coppet. Everybody sees reasons against the marriage; to me, it seems certain." But, on the 7th of July, 1802, two months afterwards, she is less positive: "We have had Benjamin for a few days. . . . His character is that of a malicious child who is always guided by the present, and on whom it is impossible to count. He seems to me to be in great fear of a marriage which I thought at first could not fail." Benjamin Constant knew that he had a master in Mme. de Staël. As long as he was not married to her, he felt that he had a chance of becoming free; he did not wish to alienate his liberty completely. She seems not to have wished it any more than he, and to have been contented with the state of things as it was. Rosalie writes to her brother on the 5th of August, 1804: "It seemed to me so natural that she should marry Benjamin, when she became free, that I did not have a doubt on the subject. It seems that they had both such a fear of it that they understood each other on the subject. . . . They hold each other by the intellect. No other man offers to her the resources of his mind. She wishes absolutely to keep him, and she succeeds, sometimes by the force of habit, sometimes by despotism, sometimes by services. He remains, but he murmurs."

He did not always content himself with murmuring, and he began to look for a wife. When Bonaparte ordered Mme. de Staël, who was making opposition to him, to retire to a distance of forty leagues from the capital, she left for Germany, and at such a moment Constant accompanied her, but deserted her at Berlin. Hearing soon afterwards that Necker was seriously ill, he left for Lausanne, and started immediately for Coppet. On the road he met the coachman of Mme. Necker, who came to announce to him the death of the former Minister of Louis XVI. The situation remained the same between Mme. de Staël and Benjamin Constant.

In a letter of December 14, 1800, to his cousin Rosalie, we find this mention: "I should like to know what has become of Mme. de Marenholtz or de Hardenberg, who is about thirty-one years old, and, if Victor has seen her, if she has spoken of me." Mlle. de Hardenberg, of a good Hanoverian family, had married a M. de Marenholtz, and the marriage had been so unhappy that she was divorced. "Though she is neither young, nor pretty, nor wealthy, she is not old, nor ugly, nor poor," wrote Rosalie concerning this person, who became the wife of Benjamin Constant. We see that even as far back as 1800 he was thinking of her. The marriage only took place on December 10, 1808. If you read the letters of Rosalie to her brother during the period which preceded the marriage, you will not be surprised that Benjamin Constant wished to make a change in his life. The scenes which Rosalie describes are almost incredible. "You don't know," she says, "the passionate character, the extreme violence, the despotism of this woman [Mme. de Staël]. She believes that her intellect gives her the right to rule over the whole universe. She wants to have slaves, especially Benjamin, whose mind suits her better than any other." What followed the marriage is worthy of the wildest novel. Though he was married, Benjamin Constant remained at Coppet, and did not dare to leave, for fear, he said, of pushing Mme. de Staël to desperate extremities. Finally, his cousin Rosalie made him feel the ridiculousness and odium of his position, and he ran away. He had kept his marriage secret for some time, and only declared it in 1809. Altogether, it is difficult to say who behaved worst in this extraordinary drama.

The father of Benjamin Constant died in 1812. He had given much trouble to his son, and had had two natural children by a servant, whom he finally married. Constant published in 1814 at Hanover his pamphlet on 'The Spirit of Conquest.' He followed King Bernadotte to Liége, and thought at that moment of defending his candidacy to the throne of France. After the return of the Bourbons he came back to Paris, and wrote several political pamphlets. He lost his aunt, the Countess of Nassau, in the month of May, 1814. About that time he fell in love with Mme. Récamier, and it was probably to please her that he wrote his famous article of March 19, 1815, in which he bitterly attacked the savage Corsican who had left Elba. A few weeks afterwards he became a member of the Council of State of the "savage Corsican." He was a gambler; he had no principles, though he was fond of writing on constitutions and laws; he looked upon life as a lottery. His famous 'Adolphe' appeared in January, 1816. Everybody recognized him in 'Adolphe,' and this novel has, in consequence, not been entirely forgotten, and it is still read occasionally by those who take some interest in Constant and in Mme. de Staël. During the Restoration Benjamin Constant remained one of the advocates of constitutionalism and of parliamentary government, and after the Revolution of 1830 he was made a Councillor. King Louis Philippe gave him 200,000 francs to pay his debts, and he died shortly afterwards. After his death the letters of Mme. de Staël to him were claimed by the Duchesse de Broglie, and were returned to her. The readers of the new volume will not find a line in it from Mme. de Staël herself; all the letters, without exception, are those addressed by Benjamin Constant himself to the members of his own family.

Correspondence.

PROTECTION AND WAGES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Among other things, I have been studying the labor question here, without books. Our laboring men are ranch-hands and cowboys. We pay the former forty dollars, and the latter forty-five and fifty dollars per month—about twice the amount paid for the same kind of labor in the States. Two brothers came out here last spring from the State of Maine, where they were paid twenty dollars per month for farm work, and are now at work on this ranch for forty dollars per month. While their present high wages are, no doubt, the result of "our protective system," why did it not protect them as well in the State where Mr. Blaine lives? I. N. Stiles.

Hobson's Ranch, Utica P. O., Montana, Aug. 20, 1888.

H. C. CAREY ON INDIRECT TAXATION.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: We have heard Henry C. Carey referred to more than once in the present campaign in support of the Republican position on the tariff question. Carey believed in protection as a means, not an end. To the present generation of protectionists, who assert that it is a good thing in itself, and should be the permanent policy of the Government, Carey is a stumbling-block that cannot be too carefully avoided.

On pages 464-465 of 'Past, Present, and Future' may be found the following:

"Everywhere it has been attempted to correct error resulting from the effort by England at indirect taxation, by other error in desiring to use tariffs as a means of similar taxation at home. It has been the substitution of plunder by a pickpocket for that of a highwayman. The whole system of indirect taxation is mere petty larceny. It is an attempt to filch that which cannot be openly demanded. It is one of those 'inventions' of man by which the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

few are enabled to grow rich at the expense of the *many*, and is therefore greatly favored by that class of men who prefer living by the labor of others to living by their own. The man who plunders a city is of the same species with the highway robber. The one who imposes indirect taxes is of the same species with the *chevalier d'industrie*. All belong to the *genus* of great men. All are equally destitute of manly or generous feeling. The plunderer of cities selects those which are weak and defenceless, and the collector of indirect taxes selects the commodities used by poor men who cannot defend themselves; and where the system most prevails, men are most weak and cheap and food most dear."

Will any one maintain that the man who wrote such words would now be in favor of retaining permanently our present system of tariff taxation? W. H. J.

SOME QUESTIONS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The *Independent* of August 16 has this on page 13:

"Ex-Senator Warner Miller is a sensible business man; and when he speaks in public, as he did last week at Angelica, he says a great many good things, as will be seen by the following sketch, to which we invite public attention:

"'The President argues that the farmers are injured by the tariff system. If it is an injury, then away with it: for agriculture is the foundation of our prosperity. . . . You get 100 per cent. more for your farm products than you did in 1860, and the prices of manufactured products are 50 per cent. less than they were then. Why Democrats should have put wool on the free list, I am puzzled to understand. . . . How much wool goes into a suit of clothes? In a heavy suit not over seven pounds, worth $1.40. Now, therefore, your suit would cost you that much more; but if you have fifty sheep, your loss by the abolition of the duty on wool would be $30. Therefore, to save $1.40 you would lose $30. I can't see the profit of that. Moreover, everything we consume on the table, with the exception of sugar, is cheaper than in Europe.'"

Now I want to know: (1.) Why it is that I hear and read so much about the straits the farmers are in, about the rarity of a New England farm free from mortgage, etc., if farmers give only half of 1860 prices for what they buy, and get double for what they sell? Farmers certainly ought to know how the matter stands with them; and one of two things, it seems to me, must be true, either the "sensible business man" was as wide of the mark when he talked on farm matters as Mr. Blaine was when he talked about savings-banks deposits and trusts in England, *or else* the farmers are in a remarkably happy condition as compared with 1860.

(2.) How is it that protected wool makes a suit of clothes with seven pounds of wool in it cost $1.40 more than it would with wool free? Mr. Miller says it would, and he is "a sensible business man," and of course he knows. An apparent explanation is, that to the cost of the home-made product Mr. Miller added *the whole amount* of the duty on the imported article. But on page 2 of the same issue of the *Independent*, fourth column, Prof. Thompson of the University of Pennsylvania refutes (to the satisfaction of the *Independent*, I take it), the position that "nearly the whole amount of the duty" is added to the cost of the home-made product. "It is Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Springer who make that assertion," he tells us, "and nobody but convinced free-traders ever make (*sic*) it." And the editor himself, on page 20 of the same issue, denies the fact of this increased cost. Somehow, the professor and editor do not seem to agree with the "sensible business man," *i. e.*, *if* the tariff on wool was 20 cents a pound. (3.) What proportion of our farmers are engaged in sheep raising?—for Mr. Miller's argument about losing $30 in order to save $1.40 can apply only to them, and even then it loses the force of its comparison unless we go on the supposition that a farmer with fifty sheep needs only one suit of clothes for his family, or only seven pounds of wool in the clothing for himself and family. And how about a farmer who has no sheep, and who can save $1.40 on every seven pounds of wool used by him in clothing himself and family? "Laughter and applause" greeted Mr. Miller's telling hit. Mr. Editor, do you imagine that that argument really fooled many farmers? (4.) Where is the sense, from the farmer's point of view, in levying a tariff for protection when "everything we consume on the table, with the exception of sugar, is cheaper than in Europe"? Why not let our farmers send their cheap products abroad and bring back what they receive in exchange, without having such a big proportion of it taken away from them in passing the United States Custom-house? Perkiomen.

WINTER IN NEWFOUNDLAND.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: My recent letter to the *Nation* on Newfoundland has occasioned the writing of letters to me by intending excursionists, one of whom proposes to camp out in Newfoundland next October. This has alarmed me so much that I hope you will allow me a few additional lines for the benefit of any others whom I may have similarly affected.

When I said that October is no more like winter in Newfoundland than in central New York, I was unhappy in my comparison, as it led to the inference that October in Newfoundland is just like October here, which is far from being true. But it is true that the last days of October do not fairly represent the month in Newfoundland any better than they do in central New York. In central New York the woods early in October are a delight to the eye, and the weather some people consider the pleasantest of the entire year; but late in October the trees are bare, and, although winter has not yet arrived, one is not surprised if all "the season's chill symptoms begin." In Newfoundland the contrast is greater. In the early days of October there is likely to be bracing weather, which nobody except a chronic invalid would call winter, while towards the end of the month winter may set in in grim earnest. Lord Baltimore complained to the King of England that winter in Ferryland began with the "middlest of October." He so wrote when sick and dispirited, and pleading for a grant of territory far south, and, under the circumstances, he naturally made the date as early as he conscientiously could. W. E. Cormack, who travelled across Newfoundland in 1822, says that winter commenced on the 17th of October in that year. He was at the time far from the western coast, towards which he was travelling, and was "alarmed" by the circumstance, as it upset his calculations. This shows that the 17th of October was an unusually early date, according to his experience, for the setting in of winter. There may be snow in Newfoundland any time after the middle of October, but one fall of snow in that country no more makes a winter than one swallow makes a summer. Nevertheless, anybody who wants to camp out for pleasure in October had better pitch his tent far from Newfoundland.

Lord Baltimore estimated the length of the winter in Newfoundland at seven months. He seems to have reckoned from the first ice to the first appearance of vegetation. But every one who has lived long in Newfoundland knows that this is putting the very worst face on the matter. The snowfall is very heavy there—heavier by far than it is anywhere in this State; and it takes many days of genial weather to clear away the snow before there can be any vegetation. The days during the last half of April and the first half of May, when the melted snow is pouring down the hillsides, are not called winter in Newfoundland, but spring. I may add that although the winters there are longer by some weeks than here, they are often less severe. Last winter was a case in point.

John C. Cozens.

Notes.

The Clarendon Press, Oxford, will bring out in October a series of more than eighty hitherto unpublished letters written by David Hume to William Strahan, the King's Printer and member of Parliament and friend of Dr. Johnson. They will be edited by Dr. G. Birkbeck Hill. The period they cover is from 1756 to 1776. Hume was no friend to the war on the American colonies, as his language to Strahan shows unmistakably. A further interest which the correspondence possesses is that it treats of the quarrel with Rousseau.

Thomas Whittaker will publish directly a cheap American edition of the 'Reminiscences of William Rogers,' a quaint and original character in the English Church.

The Rev. W. Wilberforce Newton is preparing a life of the late Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg, for publication by Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Ticknor & Co.'s September publications include 'Western China,' a journey to the great Buddhist centre of Mount Omei, by the Rev. Virgil C. Hart, Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society; a cheaper edition of Tennyson's 'Dream of Fair Women,' with all the illustrations of the first; 'A Short History of the Secession War,' by Rossiter Johnson; a new and enlarged edition of 'Recollections of a Drummer Boy,' by the Rev. Harry M. Kieffer; and the Rainbow Calendar for 1889, compiled by Kate Sanborn.

Mr. Nathan Haskell Dole is to undertake a translation of another novel by Valdés, his latest, 'El Cuarto Poder' ('The Fourth Estate'). T. Y. Crowell & Co. will publish it.

The second volume of the New York Shakespeare Society's "Bankside Shakespeare" (Brentano's), edited by Mr. Appleton Morgan, reproduces the 1594 quarto text of the "Taming of a Shrew" and the folio text of "The Taming of the Shrew" in parallel pages, with an introduction by Albert R. Frey. The authorship and date of the play are much disputed. Mr. Frey is bold enough to ascribe the older version to Shakspere, in which he occupies a very lonely position among Shakspere scholars, and he dates the new play with more positiveness than the occasion calls for as between 1607 and 1609. He examines the sources of the Induction and of the story at some length, giving its stage history and the conjectures of several commentators regarding its first production; but the essay lacks definiteness and compactness, and it is by no means the complete monograph on the text it should be. The relation of the text to Marlowe's plays, for example, is not mentioned.

To the forthcoming "Othello" volume of the "Bankside Shakespeare" Prof. Thos. R. Price will furnish an introduction claiming the "discovery of an exact prosodial system experimented upon by Shakspere in earlier plays until finally perfected in the 'Othello.'"

The third volume of Prof. Henry Morley's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"English Writers" (Cassell & Co.) covers the period from the Conquest to Chaucer, and takes into view the condition of literature on the Continent, the trouvères and troubadours, the 'Nibelungen Lied' and Minnesänger, and the Italian Revival with Frederick II. and Dante. The foreign field is entered, however, only to shed needed light on the sources and course of English literature, and the bulk of the volume deals in an encyclopædic way with the chronicles, romances, and Welsh tales, and more particularly with Layamon, Walter Map, and Roger Bacon. The extracts given are fewer than in the previous volumes. The three volumes now issued make a natural division of the subject of English literature, and are by themselves an admirable résumé of its least accessible portion.

'The Great Argument; or, Jesus Christ in the Old Testament,' by Dr. William H. Thomson, which was published in 1884 by Harper & Bros., now appears under the title of 'Christ in the Old Testament; or, the Great Argument.' In all such cases of changed titles the fact should be plainly stated on the title-page of the work, so that it might be seen that the book was not a new one, but an old one renamed.

The indefatigable Mr. Rolfe has prepared a collection, for reading in school, of 'Tales from English History' (Harper), marked by his customary skill in selection and annotation. A good example of a useful and suggestive note is that upon "The loving are the daring" (p. 163). Some of the notes appear to show marks of haste, or perhaps of undue compression. On page 132 we find the startling assertion that *and* "should never be used except to connect a *second* relative clause to the preceding." On page 124 we are told, as to chaunting, that "many words that now end in *-ant* and *-ance* were formerly spelled *-aunt* and *-aunce*, and pronounced accordingly." What is "accordingly"? On page 156 "a second Benaiah" is called a "Scriptural allusion," and we are informed that "the implied comparison cannot be understood unless we are acquainted with the Bible history"—a quite unnecessary remark, inasmuch as there is a footnote to the text which refers to the passage in the Bible. Such a note as this is mere padding.

Mr. Howells's 'A Sea Change, or Love's Stowaway' (Boston: Ticknor & Co.) reminds us that even Addison once wrote a "Fair Rosamond." "The great success this opera ["Arsinoe"] met with, produced," he writes, "some attempts of forming pieces upon Italian plans, which should give a more natural and reasonable entertainment than what can be met with in the elaborate trifles of that nation. This alarmed the poetasters and fiddlers of the town, who were used to deal in a more ordinary kind of ware, and therefore laid down an established rule, which is received as such to this day, 'that nothing is capable of being set to music that is not nonsense.'" Literature repeats itself, and now Mr. Howells forms his piece upon Gilbert and Sullivan instead of "Italian plans," but he has been too wise to indulge the laudable ambition that, according to the mortified poet, sent Addison's operetta to its damnation. The rule of nonsense "is received as such to this day." Even in nonsense, nevertheless, there are degrees, and this "lyricated farce," as the author terms it, which, being interpreted, means a comic opera, resembles its models only as much as "desiccated" codfish does the green mermaid in her native element.

In No. 46 of the Proceedings of the U. S. Naval Institute (Annapolis), together with many technical papers, we find what appears to be the concluding instalment of Lieut. Rowan's "Recollections of the Mexican War." The fact that these journal extracts have been copyrighted points to their ultimate republication, as would seem to be desirable.

The Filson Club of Louisville has issued as the third of its publications 'The Pioneer Press of Kentucky,' by William Henry Perrin (Louisville: John P. Morton & Co.). It was a hundred years on August 11, 1887, since the first number of the *Kentucke Gazette* appeared at Lexington. This was the first newspaper west of the Alleghanies, and it had its origin in the separatist movement which presently divided Kentucky from Virginia. Its publisher was John Bradford, a native of the latter State, and one of a long line of printers not connected by Mr. Perrin with the Pennsylvania printers bearing the same family name. The most prominent names of editors in early Kentucky journalism are those of Humphrey Marshall and of the two New Englanders, Amos Kendall (who afterwards, as Postmaster-General, sanctioned the rifling of the mails by Southerners in search of Northern abolition publications) and George D. Prentice. Marshall's *Western World* took the credit of exploding Aaron Burr's conspiracy, and of bringing about the court-martial of Gen. Wilkinson. Mr. Perrin has collected a great deal of curious information, but his style is careless and too much infused with slang. He evidently thinks poorly of an editor who cannot shoot, or who is not prepared for what he calls an "affaire de honour." For naïveté, the following sentences may be cited: "Human nature . . . has an innate fondness for the horrible, and it is safe to say that . . . forty-nine persons read the *Courier-Journal's* account of the trial and execution of Albert Turner, where the fiftieth reads one of Mr. Talmage's sermons."

The second number of the *Journal of American Folk-lore* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) well sustains the promise of the first. The Indians occupy a large but not disproportionate space; the Pennsylvania Germans and the Louisiana Creoles also are worthily represented—the latter by customs and superstitions and nursery tales. We observe that Mr. James Mooney, when introducing his Cherokee tale, "How the Deer obtained his Horns," expresses the hope to prove some day that the negro animal fables of the "Uncle Remus" order are of Indian origin. This is not improbable, but we may be sure they have been bettered in the borrowing.

We found little to remark in *Le Livre* for July beyond the article on "Les Bourbons Bibliophiles," by M. Eugène Asse, with its accompanying group of etched portraits. In the August number M. Lemercier de Neuville gives some intimate personal details concerning the late Charles Monselet, whose gastronomic capacity is much insisted on. For example, after his fifth meal one day, he was observed heavily hopping about to settle it, as he explained. Interesting in all respects, and a candid paper, is M. Louis de Hessem's "Le Cinquantenaire de la Bibliothèque Charpentier." Here we have an account of the origin of the *format Charpentier*—that handy shape which gave a black eye to the *format in-8°*, and did so much to popularize good literature; and we are shown the iron-clad agreement which the publisher offered to the trade in favor of his new venture. Numerous letters addressed to him on business by Alfred de Vigny, George Sand, and Sainte-Beuve, throw light on the temperament of all parties to the correspondence, and are excellent reading. The rather hard face of the indomitable G. H. Charpentier—this man so active and pushing that "il ne devait pas avoir toujours le loisir d'être aimable"—is portrayed in an etching. Among the books reviewed we notice an 'Iconographie Bretonne,' which suggests a field of useful employment for those having leisure and means, viz., the illustration of the history of a limited territory by cataloguing the portraits of its famous men and women. Such a field is offered by Essex County, Mass., for instance.

Mr. C. N. Caspar of Milwaukee has applied for a patent for a "mail book-auction," conducted by sending out unpriced catalogues, and selling to the *first* bidder if his offer proves acceptable; or if not, to the highest bidder on file at the end of four weeks. The first catalogue has gone out.

A volume supplementary to the biography of Count Cavour before 1848 has been issued at Rome under the title 'Diario Inedito e Note Autobiografiche del Conte di Cavour (1833 al 1843).'

—The absence of any contribution to the campaign in the current literary monthlies may be taken as a sign of the abandonment of the political field to the new magazines that have sprung up specially devoted to public questions. A political leader used to be one of the conspicuous features of the *Atlantic*. This seems to have gone the way of all traditions. No magazine, however, is more interested in American topics. In this number the Revolution gives a title to two excellent historical papers, one by John Fiske in his comprehensive and lively style upon the first year of the Continental Congress, the other by Dr. Peabody upon Boston mobs. The latter is a remarkable presentation of the matter from the point of view of the law-and-order portion of Revolutionary society. Dr. Peabody asserts that there was a lawless element in Boston whose excesses and outrages were an injury to the cause of the patriots, and alienated many of the best citizens, who might otherwise have remained upon the side of the colonists. His narrative of the events gives no quarter to the mob element, and may well be compared with Mr. Fiske's recent article covering the same ground. It is said here that while Massachusetts was foremost in providing leaders for the Revolution, it also suffered more than any other colony except South Carolina by the defection of Tories. Cambridge lost almost the whole body of her most reputable citizens, "men of mark and high standing," with the exception of those who were "immediately connected with the college"; and on the list of the exiles were one hundred graduates of Harvard. This is a remarkable number, and undoubtedly represents a real loss, as the descendants of these men in the provinces became leading families and held great trust and power, especially in the judiciary of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It is to be recollected, too, that Harvard was not, like Oxford and Cambridge, a bulwark of the old régime, but, on the contrary, "the hot-bed and seed-plot of sedition." It may be that this fact accounts for the anxiety of the Cambridge respectables to get away. The article is aimed at the Crispus Attucks memorial, and it makes out a serious case against it; but it seems now too late to argue the point, and, indeed, the monument will be less the memorial of a man than of the revolutionary spirit. Mrs. Wyman contributes a second paper upon Factory Life, which is philanthropic in intention, and illustrates by personal observation the beneficent workings of the Ten-Hour Law upon the lives of the women employed. Julia C. R. Dorr furnishes a pleasant sketch of a short tour in North Wales, and Mr. Downes brings his account of Boston artists down to the present day. There is the usual fiction, and the beginning of a new novel by Prof. A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

S. Hardy, "Passe-Rose." There is no poetry in the present number.

—The September *Harper's* contains a large element of travel. Mrs. Pennell begins a series of papers upon the well-worn but always fresh subject of the Hebrides, which, besides its romantic and picturesque features, well rendered in the illustrations, glances at the condition of the peasantry there and the practical workings of eviction. The American cities dealt with by Mr. Warner are Memphis and Little Rock. The former has an interesting history, of which it cannot be said that the most has been made in this article, and the latter of the two has the advantage of novelty, Arkansas being *terra incognita* to the public as much as any portion of the country. Another writer describes, in the same way, the origin and features of Helena and Butte, typical mining towns, and succeeds very well in giving sharp impressions of the economical conditions in Montana. Mr. Lafcadio Hearn continues his perfervid passages upon the West Indies. The article upon the caribou also takes us into unfamiliar ground. Thus, travel and fiction practically monopolize the number. The most important paper, however, is Prof. Morse's description of Old Satsuma ware, beautifully illustrated from his remarkable Japanese collection. This is a thorough discussion of the topic, and it need hardly be said that it is of the most reliable character, and alike interesting from the artistic point of view and as an illustration of the strange civilization to which these marvels of the potter belong. Similar in interest is the brief account of the tapestries in the new Florence gallery, of which also there are fine woodcuts. A number more exclusively devoted to information and amusement, and less exacting of any mental exercise, is not often met with; but the drift in this direction is unmistakable.

—A 'Digest of the Reported Decisions, Precedents, and General Principles enunciated by the Board of Railroad Commissioners of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, from 1870 to 1888 inclusive,' has just been prepared by Mr. John H. Wigmore of the Suffolk Bar. To the general public, the interest of such a book lies not so much in its contents as in the mere fact of its existence. It illustrates one of the ways in which law may grow up unconsciously rather than be consciously made. The Massachusetts Commission, as established nearly twenty years ago, had practically no power beyond the mere power to make reports. But their reports showed such a clear comprehension of the whole subject as to command wide public attention. What they blamed the public blamed, and the railroads ceased to defend; what they suggested the railroads tried to carry into execution, and generally with good results. Insensibly, public opinion reached such a state that the judgments of the Commission were universally accepted, and came to have the force of law, not from any power of enforcement which was behind them, but from their own inherent soundness. Recent legislation has given the Commission greater nominal power than it once had; but its actual authority has hardly been magnified. The same process of growth of law beyond the limits of technical authority is repeating itself on a larger scale in the history of the Inter-State Commerce Commission.

—It is safe to say that not more than one person in a hundred of those who read Donnelly's contributions to the Shakspere-Bacon controversy will take the pains to search the original folios and discover there for themselves the accuracy of the facts on which the marvellous cipher is constructed. Most readers will judge of the whole by the character of the argument that connects the asserted facts with the conclusions. Some external test as to the accuracy of Donnelly's asserted facts and the validity of his conclusions has therefore a current interest, and it may be found in his curious volume entitled 'Ragnarok,' which we are told was written between the earlier and later epochs of his Shaksperian investigation. 'Ragnarok' has had an extraordinary sale for such nonsense as it is. Many of its readers have been half convinced of the truth of its thesis by the wonderful array of facts, quoted from the writings of famous authors, that lead so clearly to the desired conclusion; but among these persons there can have been no geologists and no students of mythology and legendary history. The book is written to prove that a comet once struck the earth, covering half of it with gravel and furnishing a basis for many myths of fiery disasters to the early human race. From first to last, the pages contain little more than special pleading. Facts are not investigated to learn what they will lead to, nor are extracts quoted in the spirit in which they were written: quotations are made merely to support a conclusion already reached at the beginning. The quotations are something marvellous. Scientific articles and treatises, popular scientific compilations, text-books, and manuals are ransacked to furnish sentences which, thus taken apart from their context, seem to support the desired opinions; and the selections would read admirably if one could only be persuaded that they had been chosen with fairness, knowledge, and judgment.

—A brief example of the method followed may be given. It is boldly stated that the drift, as Donnelly's cometic gravel is commonly called, and which geologists regard as of glacial origin, consists of nothing but granite. Consisting only of granite, and not also of limestone, sandstone, and slate-rocks, which form so great a part of the earth's surface, how can it be the rubbish scraped from said surface by an ice-sheet? The granitic drift is plainly of igneous, not of glacial origin. The drift lies only on one side of the earth, its distribution being shown in a frontispiece map which Donnelly thinks is "substantially accurate." The drift is therefore the product of a sudden collision with a comet's tail! The only difficulty with this and other equally plain arguments is that they are all wrong. The mistakes are simply silly. There is plenty of limestone and of other aqueous rocks in the drift. The map showing the distribution of the drift is ludicrously incorrect. The argument is farcical. Yet throughout it there is an air of earnestness, conviction, and even of solemnity that is very impressive. The reader is asked to follow the argument closely, "that he may see whether any part of the theory is inconsistent with the well-established principles of natural philosophy." There is much of the short-paragraphed candor that is intended to be convincing, thus:

"Would a comet meet all these prerequisites?"

"I think it would."

"Let us proceed in regular order."

And the "regular order" is of that "put-up" kind that always rewards virtue and punishes vice in our moral melodramas.

—The Dearborn Observatory of Chicago is now removing to Evanston, Illinois, to become connected with the Northwestern University at that place. The new site is sixteen miles north and three west of the old, and within three hundred feet of the lake shore, and, according to Prof. Hough, the Director, undoubtedly is much better adapted for astronomical work than the old one. Mr. James B. Hobbs of Chicago gives $25,000 for the new observatory building, which includes abundant observing quarters for the fine instruments and some eight or nine rooms for other purposes. The Chicago Astronomical Society will continue its connection with the Observatory, having relations similar to those maintained with the late University of Chicago. The 18½-inch telescope, which has so interesting a history, will be remounted in the new dome early next year. Prof. W. R. Brooks, who has rendered most efficient service to cometary astronomy at Phelps, N. Y., where he built with his own hands the telescope which did the most of his work, has met with a well-deserved reward in the generosity of Mr. William Smith of Geneva, who has founded and built the Smith Observatory at that place. Prof. Brooks enters upon the directorship with several fine instruments; among them a 10-inch object-glass made by Clacey of Boston, and fitted with accessory apparatus for celestial photography.

— The two numbers of *Les Lettres et les Arts* for July and August (Paris: Boussod, Valadon & Cie.; New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons) contain a charming story, "Norine," by M. Ferdinand Fabre, in which the recollections of his early years spent among the remote hamlets of the Cévennes, and the longings for the *pays natal* of the middle-aged librarian of the Bibliothèque Mazarine, are mingled in the most happy manner. The unreal realism of the designs with which M. Boutet de Monvel has accompanied the story is not inharmonious with the abundant riches of M. Ferdinand Fabre's own pictures, always most vivid in what the other artist purposely effaces in his—the representations of nature which serve as a setting for the characters. The "Souvenirs d'un soldat," of Vsevolod Garshin, is also given in two parts in the numbers before us. This is a striking account of the early experiences, up to the first battle in which he took part, of a young volunteeer in the Russian Army in 1877. A certain superficial resemblance to the manner of Tolstoi, common to all Russians who write about war, takes something, at first, from the impression of originality these "Souvenirs d'un soldat" would otherwise make. They seize and hold the attention and interest to the end, however, by the vigor and individuality with which the various characters, soldiers and officers, are presented in their ordinary military life during an advance towards the enemy. A second of M. Henri Bouchot's interesting articles, "L'Histoire par les éventails populaires," is given in the July number. This extends from 1789 to 1804, and, like the preceding one, is very fully illustrated. The first part of M. Adolphe Jullien's "L'Opéra sous l'ancien régime" includes "le grand règne et la régence," and gives occasion for the really charming frontispiece of the August number—"Mademoiselle Prévost dansant au théâtre de l'Opéra," after the painting by Raoux in the Musée of Tours. In the same number M. Frédéric Masson's "Un mot sur les primitifs" is suggested by the work now in course of publication by the Vicomte Delaborde: 'Les Maîtres florentins du xve. siècle.'

THE FOUNDER OF OHIO.

Life, Journals, and Correspondence of Rev. Manasseh Cutler, LL.D. By his grandchildren, William Parker Cutler and Julia Perkins Cutler. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1888. 8vo, 2 vols., pp. 524 and 495.

EVERY one knows that this is centennial year in the Ohio Valley. The settlement planted a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

century ago has so prospered that it stands as the eastern boundary of the new empire of the West, to which it seems to be almost the ultimate parent. But the natives of Ohio are fully aware that their State was no chance growth of accidental and discordant atoms. They know that their forefathers came from other American States, and that the enterprise was the deliberate and vigorous outgrowth of New England thought, manhood, and capital. Hence, in this memorial year, and carrying out the instincts of their race, they eagerly explore the records of the past, and give a grateful and deserved prominence to the men who planned and effected the successful settlement a century ago.

Foremost among the names entitled to such remembrance is that of Manasseh Cutler, whose papers now presented to the public give the fullest proof that he is entitled to rank with Bradford, Winthrop, Penn, Calvert, and Oglethorpe, as the founder of a State. A brief examination of the facts will make this evident, and, indeed, the orators of the present year have been prompt and fervent in their praises of the Massachusetts clergyman. In his eloquent address at Marietta, on April 7, Senator Hoar gave the credit of founding Ohio to Gen. Rufus Putnam and Manasseh Cutler. That Putnam was the great leader, the man of action, is indisputable; but that Cutler's portion of the work was the more important in its results may also be affirmed. Not only was the Ordinance of 1787 the charter of the colony, but one of its provisions was of transcendent importance to the future of the whole country; possibly it may prove to have affected the future of all civilized nations. We refer, of course, to the clause providing that "there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." The results of this dedication of the West to freedom have been too great to be even epitomized in the space of a review, but no one will dispute the right of the author of the measure to rank among the great leaders of mankind.

To understand Cutler's merit, it is necessary merely to consult the authorities. Senator Hoar has briefly and clearly stated all the essentials as follows. After the cession by the individual States to the United States of their claims to the Western lands, Congress undertook to dispose of the territory:

"Various plans were reported from time to time. Nine committees were appointed on the frame of government and three on the schemes for survey and sale. Thirteen different reports were made at different times; but from September 6, 1780, when the resolution passed asking the States to cede their lands, until July 6, 1787, when Manasseh Cutler, the envoy of the Ohio Company, came to the door, every plan adopted and every plan proposed, except a motion of Rufus King, which he himself abandoned, we now see would have been fraught with mischief if it had become and continued law. Manasseh Cutler came into the Chamber on the morning of July 6, 1787, bearing with him the fate of the Northwest. He had left Boston on the evening of June 25, where on that day he records in his diary: 'I conversed with Gen. Putnam, and settled the principles on which I am to contract with Congress for lands on account of the Ohio Company.'

"He was probably the fittest man on the continent, except Franklin, for a mission of delicate diplomacy. It was said just now that Putnam was a man after Washington's pattern and after Washington's own heart. Cutler was a man after Franklin's pattern and after Franklin's own heart. He was the most learned naturalist in America, as Franklin was the greatest master in physical science. He was a man of consummate prudence in speech and conduct; of courtly manners; a favorite in the drawing-room and in the camp, with a wide circle of friends and correspondents among the most famous men of his time. It now fell to his lot to conduct a negotiation second only in importance in the history of his country to that which Franklin conducted with France in 1778. Never was ambassador crowned with success more rapid or more complete. On the 9th of July the pending ordinance was committed to a new committee. They sent a copy of the ordinance which had come over from the last Congress to Dr. Cutler, that he might make remarks and prepare amendments. . . . But one day intervened between the day of the appointment of the committee and that of their report. Cutler returned the copy of the old ordinance with his proposed amendments on one day. The next the committee reported the finished plan. But two days more elapsed before its final passage. The measure providing for the terms of sale to the Ohio Company was passed on the 27th of the same July."

Manasseh Cutler was, indeed, "a man after Franklin's pattern." He was born in Killingly, Conn., in 1742, grandson of John Cutler of Lexington, who was grandson of James Cutler, the emigrant who settled first in Watertown and then at Lexington. It was a typical New England family, and naturally, as it prospered, one son, Manasseh, was assigned to the ministry. He was graduated at Yale in 1765, where he acquired a fondness for scientific pursuits which continued through life. He taught school at Dedham, where he married Mary, daughter of the Rev. Thomas Balch, and in 1771 was settled in the ministry at Ipswich Hamlet. He was evidently an ardent patriot, and during the siege of Boston he repeatedly visited the American troops and preached to them, receiving in September, 1776, a commission as Chaplain in Col. Eben. Francis's regiment. In 1778 he was Chaplain to Gen. Titcomb's brigade, and on his return he studied medicine and became a skilful practitioner. In 1782 he opened a boarding-school, and devoted much time to natural science, becoming especially proficient in botany.

Thus, up to the age of forty-five, Cutler had pursued a career differing, as in the case of Franklin, from that of many of his contemporaries only in the bent of his mind for scientific research. Circumstances then placed him in a position to distinguish himself in a new direction. Prior to 1787 Congress had made various ineffectual attempts to deal with the land questions. It was conceded that the safety of the nation demanded that this vast territory should be peopled by its citizens, to act as a bulwark against those foreign nations which still had a foothold on our borders. It was hoped that these millions of acres might furnish the means to retrieve the national credit, and especially to enable the nation to repay the arrears due to the army of independence.

The officers and soldiers had for several years endeavored to devise some plan by which they should receive land-grants in exchange for their warrants. In 1783 a petition signed by 288 officers was presented to Congress, asking for a settlement on that basis, but, despite the powerful support of Washington, they were unsuccessful. In January, 1786, the matter was revived by a circular issued by Rufus Putnam and Benjamin Tupper. In March a convention was held at Boston, and of the eleven delegates, Manasseh Cutler was one. He was one of the five members who drafted the articles of association of the Ohio Company, the plan being to raise a fund not exceeding one million dollars in Continental certificates, with which to purchase lands in the new country. Each share was to be based on the payment of one thousand dollars in certificates and ten dollars in coin, and actual settlement in person or by proxy was essential.

In March, 1787, it appeared that 250 shares had been subscribed, and, accordingly, Gen. Samuel H. Parsons, Gen. Rufus Putnam, and Rev. Manasseh Cutler were chosen directors, with full powers to treat with Congress as to the purchase of the lands. Cutler alone assumed the task, and, fortunately, he wrote out a very full account of his actions. In June, 1787, having conversed with Gen. Putnam and "settled the principles on which I am to contract with Congress for laws on account of the Ohio Company," Cutler started for New York.

We have already mentioned his rapid and entire success in treating with Congress for the purchase of a million and a half acres of the Ohio lands for the Ohio Company. On July 9, 1787, the ordinance was referred to a committee of five members, on the 11th it was reported back, on the 12th amended on motion of Mr. Dane of Massachusetts, by adding the proviso against slavery, and on the 13th it was passed by the vote of the eight States present, Mr. Yates of New York giving the only vote in the negative. Cutler was then on a visit to Philadelphia; but on his return he carried through his negotiation for the purchase, including a still larger purchase for other parties. It is unfortunate that his Journal was written out later from his notes, and, though giving interesting facts about his travels, is very brief in regard to his interviews with members of Congress. It is, however, shown (Journal 1, 343) that his family preserved a copy of the Ordinance of 1787, and that "on its margin was written that Mr. Dane requested Mr. Cutler to suggest such provisions as he deemed advisable, and that at Dr. Cutler's instance was inserted what relates to religion, education, and slavery." Cutler himself writes, under date of July 19: "The amendments I proposed have all been made except one, and that is better qualified." This one he explains to be in regard to representation. Congress agreed to admit delegates, with the right to debate, but not vote. Cutler's son also positively states that his father told him that he prepared the clause prohibiting slavery. Having so prepared it, the clause would naturally be presented in Congress by the member from Massachusetts, Mr. Dane, who was also on the committee.

That earlier attempts had been made by others in Congress—Pickering and Jefferson—to keep this territory for freedom, does not diminish the value of Cutler's work. At the decisive moment, availing of his controlling position as the great purchaser of the lands in question, he insisted that the Northwest should be for ever free from slavery. It adds nothing to the strength of our argument that by his birth, training, and associations, he ought to have done this. Other New England ministers have been found wanting in a like case. Cutler did his duty, and the results have justified him.

Dr. Cutler served in Congress for two terms, 1800–1804, and died July 28, 1823, in his eighty-second year, still minister at Hamilton. These journals and letters contain many interesting facts, but they are of small importance in comparison with the great event of the settlement of Ohio. A generation ago they would have found many readers, as a welcome contribution to our knowledge of the period. Even now they will be valued as authority and be quoted with respect. But the great events of the past twenty-five years have ruined the public taste for chronicles of small beer.

As to the Ohio Company, a writer in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for July, 1888, states, that the contract was for 1,500,000 acres at 66⅔ cents per acre. Land-warrants were receivable for one-seventh of the amount, at the rate of 150 acres for each 100-acre warrant. These warrants were then worth $10 to $15; Government securities were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worth 10 to 12 per cent. The first payment of $500,000 was made in October, 1787, but as securities advanced in price, the subscribers failed to pay in, and 148 shares were forfeited, 769 shares were paid in full, and 83 in part. In 1792 the company went into liquidation, and, after the division of lands, $152.48 per share was paid in money. The soldier, therefore, received for his payment of $17 in money and his 100-acre land-warrant, 1,273 acres of land and $130 in money, which sum at the time would buy him 3,250 acres more. It is characteristic of this enterprise, founded and carried out by a New England minister, that it was equally successful in its moral and material aspects.

EMPEROR WILLIAM AND HIS BOSWELL.

Aus dem Leben Kaiser Wilhelms. 1849-1873. Von L. Schneider. Berlin: Otto Janke; New York: B. Westermann & Co. 1888. 3 vols., 8vo, pp. 341, 286, 291.

Louis Schneider began life as an actor. He was born in 1805 of a theatrical family, his father being a musical director and composer; his mother, brother, and sister opera singers. His first appearance on the stage was made at the age of nine, and at the age of fifteen he was a regular member of the profession and had his name printed on a play-bill. His connection with the stage ceased in 1848, when he became reader to King Frederick William IV. In the intervening years he had made his mark as a journalist and man of letters. Although a civilian, he edited two military periodicals, contributing at the same time to several of the leading Prussian newspapers, and publishing sketches, novels, poems, plays, and historical and biographical works. His versatility, his rampant loyalty to the royal family, and his total freedom from diffidence, procured him a position at the Prussian court which was anomalous if not unprecedented, and in which he maintained himself with great skill for twenty-five or thirty years. For a long time he was the only person not of noble birth who was permitted to sit at meals with the royalties, and he was on confidential if not on intimate terms with three successive Prussian kings and two Russian emperors. Besides his official position as reader, he performed, unpaid, the functions of librarian to King William I., who used him as a convenient medium for indirectly conveying his views on public affairs to the public through the semi-official press, which was always ready to print Schneider's articles, proceeding, as they were presumed to do, from the highest authority. He accompanied his sovereign in the campaigns of 1866 and 1870, during which he had daily interviews with the King, to whom he submitted proofs of the letters which he wired to the Berlin newspapers, and which were thus corrected and edited by the Commander-in-Chief. It was also his self-imposed duty to keep the King informed of the opinions and comments of the press in all parts of the world. All of these matters and other episodes in his varied career are most entertainingly set forth in the three volumes of Schneider's posthumous memoirs, published in 1879 and 1880.

The present work is more particularly devoted to a glorification of the late Emperor William, and was left in manuscript with the understanding that it was not to see the light during the lifetime of that monarch. The position which its author occupied naturally raises great expectations, which are, just as naturally, doomed to be in some measure disappointed, as it was next to impossible to say anything new on a subject which had recently been so much written about. But while the book adds, perhaps, not much to our stock of historical knowledge, it contributes not a little in the way of details and minor touches, and will be drawn on liberally by every future historian who undertakes to paint a lifelike portrait of William I. The Emperor has found his Boswell in Schneider, as Bismarck found his in Busch, with the difference, however, that Schneider is a writer whose natural gifts are supplemented by a high degree of culture. The mechanical execution of the work is praiseworthy in every respect, and the only sin to be laid at the door of the publisher is the unfortunately very common one of neglecting to provide an index, for which not even the poor substitute of headlines is offered.

The first and prevailing impression which the reader of these volumes receives is the predominant militarism of the Prussian court and rulers. Everything is done by and for the army; everything is subservient to the army; army officers are the chief persons in the realm, and civilians almost seem to exist only on sufferance. Liberals and Radicals are objects of aversion and suspicion, not so much because they oppose the Government as because they would curtail the importance of the army, cut down the period of compulsory service, and reduce the army estimates. The most serious and stubborn conflicts between the executive and the legislature have almost always hinged on these cardinal points. As Prince of Prussia, as Regent, as King, and as Emperor, William was the incarnation of this overshadowing military principle. Of this well-known bent of his character Schneider's book affords much minor corroboration, as in showing the immense importance attached by King and court to the matter of orders, crosses, medals, uniforms, and other branches of what, from an American point of view, seems little more than army millinery. We are informed that the King was very particular and conscientious in wearing the special uniform which each particular occasion demanded (vol. i, p. 191). On a visit to Olmütz in 1853, the Prince of Prussia started on his journey wearing a Prussian uniform; several stations before his destination he donned his Austrian uniform, because the Emperor of Austria was to meet him at the station; arrived at his lodgings he found a number of officers of the Sixth Prussian Army Corps waiting to pay their respects, and, in order to receive them becomingly, had to change the Austrian to the Prussian uniform. Scarcely had they departed when it was announced that the Emperor was coming to pay a visit, when the change had to be made back again; then a messenger came in breathless to say that the Emperor of Russia was coming at once, and a Russian uniform, with all the stars and ribbons thereunto belonging, had to be put on in place of the Austrian. After receiving Nicholas, the Prince returned the visit of Francis Joseph, which, of course, had to be done in the Austrian uniform, which latter had to be assumed again for dinner, as, during the interval spent at home, the Prince could not, with propriety, wear any but the Prussian uniform. All of this was done within two hours, and, as the author says, was unavoidable (vol. i, pp. 141-2). On one occasion the Prince administered a severe reproof in writing to Schneider because a newspaper report supposed to be written by the latter had stated that, at a military review, the Prince had appeared in civilian dress, when, as a matter of fact, he had been in full uniform (i, 34). If troops passed the King's window, he showed himself, but never without first buttoning up his uniform coat and putting on the order "pour le mérite" (i, 76).

Pages upon pages are consumed in giving accounts of orders and decorations conferred by the King and conferred upon him. Eight pages are required to ventilate the author's grievance at not receiving a certain order to which he considered himself entitled (i, 40-49). About the same space is filled with exuberant telegrams and letters exchanged between King William and the Emperor Alexander in December, 1869, when Prince Albert of Prussia visited St. Petersburg, and the Emperor conferred the order of St. George on the King of Prussia, the latter returning the compliment by sending the order *pour le mérite* to his imperial nephew. One brief specimen telegram is all we have space for; it is from William to his brother Albert, and is dated Berlin, December 8, 6½ P.M.: "Well, what an honor has been done me! I am overjoyed, but completely overcome. I take my revenge by offering the Emperor the *pour le mérite*. If you have two crosses, give him one" (ii, 87-96). As having some connection with this subject, and showing the footing on which Schneider stood with his patron, it may be related that in July, 1872, as the Emperor William was leaving Wiesbaden, he inquired for certain officials who were to bring him an order of the Red Eagle. As they had already taken their departure, Schneider offered to give up his, if the ribbon did not look too much worn. The Emperor said: "I want to do a favor to Col. von Witzleben by conferring this order on him before I go; you can take it to him with a letter, and can explain to him why the ribbon is not fresh." "Could I not tell the Colonel that your Majesty had taken the ribbon from your own breast? That would please the old gentleman still more." "I cannot forbid you to tell a lie, if you choose to do it; but I will have nothing to do with that" (iii, 246-7).

William's predilection for the army is also indicated by various anecdotes showing great knowledge and a remarkable memory concerning the personnel of the forces. Habitually he read the lists of the killed and wounded among the officers with great attention, sometimes attaching to each name some comment showing his intimate acquaintance with their personal history, and then laying down the paper silently, shaking his head (iii, 73). He grieved much over the losses his armies sustained. During the campaign of 1866 he declined an invitation to visit a theatre in Prague, saying: "One who has seen so many of his brave soldiers dead and wounded cannot go to the theatre" (i, 270). He was, indeed, of a kindly disposition, and it was a most difficult matter to obtain his signature to a death-warrant. When one was sent to him, he delayed returning it until the Minister of Justice, tired of waiting, would ask for it; then he began searching among his portfolios, and would say that he must have left it at Babelsberg; but if the request happened to be made in the palace of Babelsberg, it would unfortunately have been left in Berlin. When he assumed the government as King, he impressed it upon his assembled ministers as a sacred duty to call his attention to any, the most insignificant, attenuating circumstance in every case of capital punishment, in order that, whenever possible, the extreme penalty might be commuted. He went patiently through the details of every such case, and if he could find no ground for clemency, he put the papers on one side as if expecting that some festive event would afford a pretext for amnesty. When such an occasion did present itself, whole batches of death-sentences would come piling into the Ministry of Justice, all commuted to imprisonment for life. The author reports a case which shows how the King delayed in these

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matters. A sentence of death was pronounced October 1, 1861; on January 13, 1862, the Minister moved before the King, "that justice be allowed to take its free course," that being the official formula in which the monarch assents to a sentence of death. Not until August 19 did the King give his assent; he did not affix his signature until at the meeting of the Ministers not a single voice was heard in behalf of the murderer. September 9 was set as the day of the execution; but as Prince Henry was to be baptized on that day, the Minister of Justice informed the King at Baden that the execution was postponed to September 16; the King returned this communication with the following marginal note, in his own handwriting: "Is there really no extenuating circumstance whatever which would justify a commutation? Anyhow, if at all possible, let another date be named, as I never wish to know the day of an execution." In consequence of all these delays the sentence finally *was* commuted (i, 161-4). Another similar story in the same place cannot be here reproduced for lack of room.

William's mildness of temper also manifested itself in his mildness of language and in his treatment of those in his service. Never, says our author (i, 71), did an abusive word or an oath pass his lips; he preserved his equanimity in the most trying circumstances; none of his servants ever heard from his mouth an unfriendly word or one that could wound him. Several anecdotes illustrate this trait, of which a single short one must here suffice. One night, at half-past eleven o'clock, when he was returning from the Rhine, the carriages which were to have met him at the station had, through a misunderstanding, been sent elsewhere. The situation was embarrassing to all the party. The King alone manifested no impatience, but simply said, "Well, let us walk; fortunately, the weather is good." He was so convinced that no one in his service would willingly cause him inconvenience that he attributed the occurrence to accident, and said nothing more about it. On one occasion, while the King was conferring with Schneider in the library at Babelsberg, he heard voices in the adjoining rooms, and said, "Come into the corridor; they are going to show strangers through here," and continued the conversation outside until the visitors had finished their inspection of the library. He was equally placid in keeping the even tenor of his ways amid the discouragements of his two great campaigns. To those who now look back on the wars of 1866 and 1870 they appear an uninterrupted series of brilliant successes, and they even appeared so to many who witnessed them or took part in them. The King, however, was always disposed to take a sober view, and in neither war had great faith in a speedy termination of the conflict. After the battle of Sedan, when all Germany was discounting the future, he alone foresaw that the campaign might last through the winter, and that the resources of the French were not nearly exhausted. It will never do, he said, to underestimate the foe (i, 269, ii, 231, 246, 274, iii, 71). But although he did not always share the general elation, he was not unduly depressed nor ever excited. On September 3, 1870, the day after Napoleon's surrender, he was transacting the civil home affairs of his kingdom as calmly as in the piping times of peace (ii, 223). His great industry and capacity for work are well known, but it will be news to many to learn from these volumes how fluent and even eloquent he was as an orator, how ready and precise as a writer. He never, we are told, corrected anything he wrote. His style was direct, without rhetorical phrasemaking, that being foreign to his nature. After the King had made a speech, he usually again dictated the substance of it to Schneider for his newspaper reports; Schneider would then bring him the proofs, and says that he never succeeded in making his report concise and positive enough, and that his finest passages, introduced to make a more effective impression, were unmercifully cut. It should here be added that Schneider's style is by no means exuberant, but rather easy and elegant, and almost always in correct taste, which throws William's simplicity of character still more into relief. One instance may be cited. In his speech delivered to his generals and staff on March 3, 1871, after the final conclusion of peace, the Emperor concluded: "But let us not forget that we all owe our thanks to Providence, which willed that we should become the instrument for bringing about such grand world-historical events." The next morning early he dictated this speech to Schneider, as usual, from memory. Schneider went into the next room to elaborate his notes. It occurred to him that not even the most powerful mortal was justified in assuming so much familiarity with the designs of Providence, and he allowed himself the alteration, "Providence has *permitted* us to become its instrument." Quite proud of the emendation, he returned to the Emperor's study, and submitted his draft for approval. When he came to this passage the Emperor interrupted him: "That is not what I said. I said, 'Providence has *willed*.'" "I had it so written in pencil," replied Schneider, "but in making my draft I doubted whether every reader would correctly apprehend your Majesty's course of thought. No mortal can know what Providence has willed." "Do you suppose," was the answer, "that I could have borne the heavy burden of this war, or that such successes would have been possible, if I had not been firmly convinced that Providence willed it, and chose us for its instrument? Write exactly as I dictated to you." Schneider, with his phenomenal obstinacy and impudence, insisted upon the Emperor's changing "permitted" into "willed" in his own handwriting and signing the entire manuscript, in order to satisfy his scruples (iii, 201-2).

Of the proverbial economy, not to say parsimony, of the Emperor, these volumes afford several illustrations. When Schneider asked for permission to go to St. Petersburg to the funeral of the Empress of Russia, the reply was, "Certainly, go ahead, but at your own expense!" A most characteristic incident occurred during the campaign of 1870. A poem had got into the newspapers in 1872 about a hacked and battered helmet which the King was said to have picked up from the battle-field and preserved as a memento. Schneider read it to William, who said there was no truth in it, and thereupon told him that he did remember a similar scene; he noticed a dead hussar on the battle-field, and what attracted his attention was that his uniform was perfectly new, showing that the man could not possibly have made the march from the boundary to the Moselle, but must have just joined his regiment. He told an officer to see whether the hussar was really dead, and, being assured of that, gave orders that the uniform should be taken off and sent to the regiment, where it might still do good service. On which Schneider took the liberty of remarking that Prussia no doubt owed its greatness to the unprecedented fact that it had had a series of fourteen economical rulers (iii, 229-30).

The Emperor's economical habits also manifested themselves in his well-known plainness of living, which, however, was partly the natural outcome of his plainness of character. When he took up his headquarters in Baron Rothschild's country house at Ferrières, and saw the lavish splendor with which it was furnished, he said, "I cannot allow myself anything of that kind, and have taken the plainest room." For his study he took the bath-room, but declined to use the magnificent bedroom to which it belonged, and had his cot put up in an adjoining chamber. He allowed himself no indulgence in luxuries or in idleness. None of those about him ever saw him unoccupied. He was habitually prompt in answering letters on the very day on which he received them, and had a habit of returning the answers in the same envelopes in which the letters came to him. It was in this way that he appointed Bismarck Chancellor of the *Empire*. On January 18, 1870, the day on which William was crowned Emperor, he returned the papers relating to the ceremony in the original envelope, but made a change in the address. It had read, "To the Emperor's Majesty, from the Chancellor of the Confederacy (*Bundeskanzler*)," and he crossed out the word "Bundes," writing over it "Reichs" (iii, 157).

Another instance of William's activity and endurance at an advanced age is found in the record of the day of Sedan, when he was at work bodily and mentally for sixteen hours, from nine in the morning till past midnight, notwithstanding which he was ready for his daily task at half-past seven the next morning.

Many other traits are here described and illustrated, such as his respect for property of the enemy, as shown in his refusal to take for himself any books from the libraries of St.-Cloud or St. Cyr, his consideration for Napoleon, and, generally, his generous disposition towards his enemies in war, his patience in adjusting the conflicting claims of the civil and the military authorities in the midst of war, his prevailing seriousness of character, and the like. For all this, and for many interesting details concerning the wars and the foreign relations of Prussia during the years 1866 to 1870, the reader must be referred to the book itself, which will no doubt be soon translated into English, as it has already been done into French.

Fifty Years Ago. By Walter Besant. Harpers. 1888.

Mr. Walter Besant's Jubilee volume is so richly illustrated as to make the cuts almost its main feature. These sketches of the look of the streets and houses, the crowds, the typical characters of the pavement, the demolished shops, taverns, and public buildings, the sports and the humors of the time, tell a story by themselves, and the revival of the *Fraser Gallery* of portraits is enough of itself to render the volume welcome. These caricatures often keep so close to the reality that they seem the most speaking likenesses, and make the men of the time live before our eyes in a most surprising way. Those of Coleridge and Rogers are "the lean and slippered pantaloon" itself, and have, besides, the individuality of their originals; Wordsworth's and Scott's are unique, and "Dizzy's" is the dandy *au naturel*, while those in which there is no caricature in fact (such as Carlyle's and Leigh Hunt's) are admirable portraits. The volume, however, is a written as well as a pictured one, and although one glances at the illustrations first, as nearly every reader will be sure to do, it would not be pardonable to neglect the text; for Mr. Besant has written with great vigor, and succeeds in representing the times very much more fully than do the illustrations, numerous and striking as these are.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He naturally begins with statistics of comparison between the old and the new, in order to gain perspective, but when he has satisfied the reader of the vast increase of the British Empire and all things pertaining to it, in the spirit which ought to be every one's at a jubilee, he gets quickly to his work. He really gives us his point of view in a word by saying that in 1837 England was still in the eighteenth century. The nineteenth began with machinery, the Reform Bill, and science, with steam communication, the expansion of the colonies, and the opening of the universities, with the diffusion of political power through the State, the philanthropic "interference" of law, the religious revival; but fifty years ago was before all this. Manners and morals then were perceptibly different to that degree which separates one epoch from another, and the controlling element in society was still the eighteenth century. For example, Mr. Besant says that, at the time of the accession of Victoria, "there was no loyalty at all either to the Queen or to the institution of a limited monarchy or to the constitution or to the Church." He is speaking, of course, of the people. "There had been no loyalty since the Stuarts; for exactly one hundred and fifty years not one sovereign who sat upon the throne of England could boast that he had the love of his people. Not one wished to have the love of the people. He represented a principle; he governed with the assistance of a few families and by the votes of a small class. As King he was a stranger. When he drove through the streets, the people hurrahed; but they did not know him and they cared nothing for him."

Mr. Besant pays much attention to the people; he thinks they were never worse off than in the middle of the eighteenth century, never more degraded, and in 1837 this brutal stage of their condition still continued. He wonders how England got on without a mob revolution, and seems to ascribe the apathy of the masses to their being cowed by "Father Stick"—in other words, to the habit of wholesome obedience inculcated by flogging, in a time when everybody was whipped—women at Brideswell, criminals at the cart-tail, 'prentices, soldiers, sailors, slaves, and boys. The number and the virulence of abuses were, to a man of the author's eyes, astounding. The condition of the prisons accuses the civilization of the time, and that of the factories and mines brings a still heavier indictment against its Christianity. Yet Mr. Besant acknowledges that those who were responsible for these things or reaped their profits, and who looked on unmoved, were very good, well-intentioned people, fond of their own interests, but with no worse hardness of heart. The progress made in bettering the condition of the laboring classes in the last fifty years constantly provokes a pæan of thanksgiving from him:

"It is not true, as stated in a very well known work, that the poor have become poorer, though the rich have certainly become richer. The skilled workingman is better paid now than then, his work is more steady, his hours are shorter. He is better clad, with always a suit of clothes apart from his working dress; he is better taught; he is better mannered; he has holidays; he has clubs; he is no longer forbidden to combine; he can coöperate; he holds meetings; he has much better newspapers to read; his food is better and cheaper; he has model lodging-houses."

With this reassuring passage one can turn from this portion of the volume with better spirits; for what with ignorance and atheism, gin and rum, the chimney-sweep and the child-trap keeper, the rowdy fair, the prison, and the criminal code with two hundred and twenty-three capital offences, these chapters are chilling reading.

The people were but a part of society, and Almack's was at the other extreme, with Crockford's for diversion, and the land of clubs and cards. This lives for us in Thackeray. Then there were Lady Blessington's and Holland House, in literature. The list is too long to be enumerated, for Mr. Besant covers a broad field. One or two of the more striking of his observations may be cited. The theatres entertained about twenty thousand nightly, and now he reckons that, notwithstanding their increase and the growth of London, they do not have more spectators. The reason is, that city men live in the suburbs now, too far away to come in for the play, and it is left for the visitors largely to support the drama. If the theatre had grown as the city has, there should be six times as large an audience. On the other hand, the clubs, which then had twenty thousand members, are now calculated to include one hundred and twenty thousand. This indicates the vast social change which has broken down old professional barriers of intercourse and caused a more free movement. It also indicates the decline of the tavern, which was the old club-room, and was still in vigor fifty years ago. Mr. Besant seems to lament this change. Another loss which he regrets is the decline of the Ring, and he hails the prospect of its revival with enthusiasm:

"The decay of boxing during the last twenty-five years has been certainly followed by a great decay of the national pluck and pugnacity, and therefore naturally by a decay of national enterprise. We may fairly congratulate ourselves, therefore, that the noble art of self-defence is reviving and promises to become as great and favorite a sport as before. Let all our boys be taught to fight. Only the other day I read that there are no fights at Eton any more because the boys 'funk each other.' Eton boys funk each other! but we need not believe it. Let there be no nonsense listened to about brutality. The world belongs to the man who can fight."

Few on this soil will share Mr. Besant's regrets or hopes on this subject. Another fact he remarks upon is that the "noise of mighty London" is no longer heard. There is still a rumble, but not the old roar. "Your London, Eighty-seven, will not know how to roar"; first, because the streets of fifty years ago were "not macadamized or asphalted or paved with wood; next, the traffic of wagons, carts, and wheelbarrows and hand-carts is vastly greater than you had ever previously imagined; then there is a great deal more of porter work done in the street, and the men are perpetually jostling, quarrelling, and fighting"; to which elements of discord the man of Thirty-seven goes on to add the coaches before the time of railway traffic, the great freight wagons, the wooden sledges, the donkey with coals, and the whole Babel of street cries, now silent. But the characteristic of the "roar of London" is not its loudness, but its continuousness.

The subjects which Mr. Besant has drawn into his volume are as various as the aspects of life in the greatest Christian city—though the adjective seems strangely out of place. The great topic of the position of women, which was correctly described by the title of Mr. Mill's treatise as "subjection," is lightly touched upon; that of practical jokes somewhat fully, and wonder (in which we share) is expressed that people did not fall upon the wits, and especially Jerrold, with immediate personal violence. That there is a brutality in superior wit as well as in superior muscle, the anecdotes of the time amply show. In this respect manners have improved, if we have lost something in dignity and graciousness of demeanor, the ways of "the old school." Mr. Besant protests, however, against the notion that we have lost in leisure. He declares he cannot find that vaunted "leisure" either in the fiction or the fact of the eighteenth century, which was one of downright hard labor commonly speaking—much harder than to-day's. It was just at this period, too, that the "great drop" in poetry occurred, following the popularity of Byron. The British public suddenly, and without warning, stopped buying verse, and it has never begun again, poetry continuing to be the most sluggish article in the literary market to this day. The one thing that has suffered no change is the Court. Now, as then, the Court is in the hands of a few families and entirely disconnected with the life of the nation, which goes on as if the Court "did not exist." Mr. Besant put it in italics, but plain print will be emphatic enough: "The whole of these men who in this generation maintain the greatness of our country in the ways where alone greatness is desirable or memorable, except in arms—the only men of this generation whose memories will live and adorn the Victorian era—are strangers to the Court."

It will be seen that his volume takes a wide range, that it is not the year 1837 he tells of, but rather the social conditions of an age, with much comparison of old and new. There is next to nothing of individuals in his pages; but the lack is made up for by the "profuse illustrations," which include the faces of the distinguished persons then alive. Among the rest we observe a curious one of Emerson at the period, and another of Tennyson, both small. But both in cuts and text the volume is equally happy.

Gouverneur Morris. By. Theodore Roosevelt. [American Statesmen Series.] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1888.

Of the three clearly marked classes composing the population of New York at the date of the Revolution—the great landholders, the rich traders, and the farming and artisan multitude—the first was unquestionably that one which risked the most in taking up arms. If the rebellion failed, the fate of its members was sure ruin, and probable hanging. If the Revolution triumphed, an untried government by the many boded danger to their station and estates. All honor to those whose convictions ranged them on the right side, against their doubts whether it was the safe one. How great the wavering and the conflict were can only be noted in an epitome like this biography. Curiosity as to details may be amply gratified by the venomously prejudiced but instructive monograph of Dawson on 'Westchester County in the Revolution.'

The family of Gouverneur Morris was of the manorial class in that county. As a younger son, of slender means, he chose this city for his field, and the law for his profession. His preceptor was William Smith, afterwards Chief Justice of the province, an enigmatical character, described by Tory historians as one of that young triumvirate of Yale graduates, resolved on pulling down Church and State, who, in the year of Morris's birth, formed a club with that object. The pupil's liberal bent was not likely to be warped under such culture. His profession, bringing him into association with Hamilton and Jay, he soon exchanged for political action, which thenceforward united them as the three leaders among the statesmen of New York.

That Morris did not run an equal race in statesmanship with the other two, and does not stand quite their peer in history, was not due

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to want of power, or conviction, or honesty. He was fertile in thought, a terse and picturesque speaker, and almost prophetic in foresight. But "he inherited a certain whimsical streak, that ran through his character." While this eccentricity heightened the charm of his personality, it sometimes deflected his aims, and perverted his conduct into inconsistencies that bear no explanation except such as this congenital defect supplies. As an early instance, while yet under age, he effectively attacked a bill pending in the New York Assembly to provide an issue of paper money, pressing all those arguments unhappily too familiar to us by iteration. A few years later, dropping his theories, he reported, while a member of the Provincial Congress, in favor of such an issue, to be made a national measure. The best excuse for inconsistency is that his doctrine was right in the first case and his practice necessary in the last.

A few years later, at the age of twenty-eight, he proved his mastery of the subject by a series of essays on finance and taxation. Their merit led to his selection as assistant by Robert Morris, official "Financier" under the Confederation. In this office he did great service by aiding to establish the Bank of North America; and still greater by preparing a plan for the national coinage, which, as afterwards simplified by Jefferson and modified by Hamilton, became the basis of our present metallic system.

The next step in Morris's public career was his mission from Pennsylvania as a delegate to the Convention to form a National Constitution. No one brought to that assembly a more thorough-going national spirit. In that gathering of the sifted genius of the country he held place with the best as a broad and ingenious thinker, a keen reasoner, and a precise and vigorous speaker. In discussion he was constant and insistent, calling things by their right names, and speaking out on the question of slavery the truths that others whispered. On most of the other subjects of debate in the Convention, Morris took sound positions, and enforced them with power. The biographer finds fault with his incurable cynicism and disbelief in all generous motives. In such an assembly the *advocatus diaboli*, exceptional as he then was, may be a safer counsellor, though not for his own fame, than a sentimentalist.

Probably his "deep-rooted distrust of mankind" inspired two plans proposed by him, so singular that the most excessive whimsicality cannot account for them. One was, to constitute an aristocratic Senate for life, with a democratic House, each having a personal interest in watching and checking the other. The friction even under our present system may teach us how such machinery would have jarred and strained until it came to a full stop. The other proposition, less theoretical, but more narrow and short-sighted, was to secure to the seaboard States, by a constant majority of votes, the absolute control of the Union, and the right to impose such conditions on the Western States, when admitted, as to keep them always subordinate to the East. He feared combinations between the West and the South injurious to Northern interests. No one could then foresee the rise of a counterbalancing Northwest.

A singular instance is within the reviewer's experience of a like want of foresight in a great mind. Twenty years before the civil war, Judge Story, lecturing to his law classes, often intermingled with his vivid recital of the difficulties in framing the Union, and his fervid counsels of devotion to its maintenance, grave doubts and warnings as to the danger to be feared from a future combination between the West and the South to seize and divide the public domain. The seer had no vision of the slaveholders' war.

Business interests called Morris, when thirty-seven years of age, to Paris. He arrived there early in 1789, while Jefferson was our Minister, and while the French Revolution was in the first stage of its development. In the spring of 1792 he succeeded Jefferson and remained as Minister until recalled in 1794, at the request of the French Government, only because Genet had just been withdrawn at the request of ours. He remained some time longer in Europe, engaged in complicated business affairs, and returned to America, after an absence of more than nine years, in 1798. These years witnessed the most amazing events of modern history in the hideous progress of the French Revolution, of which his diaries and letters preserve a contemporary record of surpassing interest. His insight, his experience, his impartial truthfulness, and his relation as friend and counsellor to all who were best worth knowing in Paris, give these writings a value shared by no other record of that period. The ample extracts given by the biographer are among the most interesting pages of this volume, and justify the statement that his writings are more valuable to the historian of his time than those of any of his contemporaries. His official duties were discharged under difficulties and amid dangers from which the envoys of all other nations judged it prudent to withdraw, and with such courage, dignity, and wisdom as well merit the praise that "we have never had a foreign minister who deserved more honor than Morris."

Curiously contrasting, yet in many respects curiously resembling, the life of Morris in Europe, was that of another self-expatriated American. Joel Barlow, two years his junior, came to Paris a year before him, and left it a year after him. He, too, sold wild lands, for which purpose he first went out. He, too, speculated boldly, and made a fortune in large business enterprises. He was much in England, too, and no friend of that Government, and closely allied with the French leaders, but with those of the worst kind. He even supported the Revolution as a pamphleteer, became a French citizen, and was talked of as a member of the Convention from Savoy. Instead of charming letters and valuable diaries, he achieved the failure of a stupendous epic. Yet in the public employment, under a Federal Administration, he braved great dangers and rendered great services in Barbary. We do not recall any mention of him in Morris's published letters. They must have met, for both were friends of Jefferson, and it would be interesting to know how they regarded each other.

Morris reëntered the Senate in time to assist at the decadence of the Federal party. As time went on, the weakness of the new Administration exasperated Morris into "an opposition so violent that his follies surpassed the worst of the follies he condemned." The painful details of the closing days in his public career are minutely pictured by the biographer, culminating in the description that "throughout the war of 1812 he appeared as the open champion of treason to the nation, of dishonesty to the nation's creditors, and of cringing subserviency to a foreign Power."

The biographer's style is easy, graceful, and spirited, while his method leaves something to be desired. It is rather discursive, apt to effervesce into facile generalities on slight suggestion. In minor points, we could miss without regret the uncouth Gallicism, "goes without saying," that would have delighted Jefferson; and could wish that "voiced" had never crept into books from the reporter's column. And in another edition, besides some typographical amendments, "cet éloge," instead of "cette," and *Carnes* corrected to *Carmes* would be welcome.

Housekeeping Made Easy. By Christine Terhune Herrick. Harper & Bros.

THIS volume is made up of a series of papers that appeared first in *Harper's Bazar*. One cannot look through its pages without feeling that the writer is a sensible woman, with a practical knowledge of the subject on which she writes. If there is a novice in housekeeping who has not a theory of her own to carry out, she will find a safe adviser in Mrs. Herrick, and she will be sure of finding rules for the ordering of all departments of her new realm. Indeed, so minute are the directions that one is disposed to think there is to be a revival of the methods of our grandmothers as well as of their fashions in dress. Of late it has seemed as if the minute attention of the mistress of the house to the duties or economies of the household, was an old fashion that was passing away. Our author is evidently not of this school; her book is meant as a guide to the mistress of a small establishment who is just coming into her kingdom. The estimates and the lists given, however, are often meant for a family of five, rather than the family of two which is the usual number a novice has to keep house for, unless she marries a man with a "ready-made family."

In the furnishing of a house Mrs. Herrick wisely distinguishes between the "must haves" and "may haves," and she gives a scale by which to proportion expenses that seems a good one in the main, if she had only allowed a wider margin for the unforeseen drains on the purse. It is as true in regard to household contingencies as in other things, that it is the "unexpected that happens." Thus, "a man with an income of two thousand dollars a year has no right to devote more than one-fourth of that to payment for the roof to cover him. If he can get it for less, so much the better. . . . It may at least be said that not more than one-quarter should be given to food, not more than one-eighth to service, and about the same amount to fuel and lights." This leaves only one-quarter of the income for clothing, etceteras, and the "unexpected." We are afraid it is not enough. Unless there is a fairy godmother in the family, there will be heartaches in January and in July, and heartaches cause bodily aches and failing strength in the head of the family.

The house Mrs. Herrick recommends one to search for will be hard to find, we suspect, but one is so often called on to sacrifice one's ideal, that it may as well be done at the outset. She gives good advice about asking the landlord for all needed repairs and changes before taking the house, and about making the agreement in writing. She advises a clear understanding with a servant as to her work and her privileges before she is engaged. There are also wise directions as to giving a servant time for the care of her own room, and for saving her trouble by waiting on one's self. There are two sides to the question of supplies in large quantities: the housekeeper can tell better whether too much is used if they are obtained weekly or monthly. Mrs. Herrick dwells too much on drapery. In her regard for curtains and portières, she seems to lose sight of the general principle, that because they make a large room look cosey and inhabited, they also belittle a small one and make it seem "stuffy." She is fully alive to the horrors of a "parlor set," or of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an ornamented dust-pan or milking stool, or the family photographs on the walls; and she is aware of the power of growing plants and of books to give a room an air of being lived in. Yet she sensibly says, in speaking of the sitting-room, "If this is to be a place where every one may feel at his ease, rigid principles cannot be established. The home feeling is worth more than even spotless tidiness."

The fault of the book is, that it does not clearly distinguish between the desirable and the possible in regard to the style of living, and it often leaves one in doubt whether one maid or two or more are expected to do the work which is mapped out. In a family of five, where only one servant is kept, if there is a dinner of five courses, it will take at least three hours to clear the table, wash the dishes, and return them to their places. If the mistress attempts to have so much done each day, she will lose either her health or her maid, and perhaps both. It also seems as if the writer made the common mistake in America of recommending a too elaborate menu for the entertainment of company, which, of course, leads to the other mistake of entertaining but seldom. She recommends putting by part of one's income each year, but, alas! she cannot solve the problem how one is to avoid living up to one's income when the income is small. It would have been well if the book offered guidance as to the amount of tea, coffee, laundry soap, and such things required each week in a small family, that the housekeeper might be provided with a standard by which to order her own outgoings.

'Housekeeping Done Thoroughly' would have better defined the book. Rules given may reduce housekeeping to a science, but it does not follow that it is easy to acquire the science, nor that the rules are carried out without effort. To keep house is the best and the truest way of living, but it is not the easiest way, especially if the eye of the mistress is to be in every place, as this book recommends, and as is undoubtedly best when her income is small. The true woman will bear her housekeeping burdens cheerfully and uncomplainingly, as a true man bears the strain of providing for the needs of a family; and the happiness that comes from a duty fulfilled will help to lighten her task.

Cricket. By A. G. Steel and R. H. Lyttelton. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

THIS is another of the Badminton Library of books devoted to sports and pastimes, and it is as interesting to those who care for such subjects as its predecessors have been. Mr. Andrew Lang contributes chapters on the "Archæology of the Game" and on "Border Cricket," while Mr. F. Gale writes of "Country Cricket," Mr. W. G. Grace on "How to Score" and "Outfit," Mr. R. A. H. Mitchell on the "Art of Training Young Cricketers," and the two editors divide the remaining eight chapters between them.

In endeavoring to ascertain the age of this "great, glorious, and unsurpassable game," as one of its admirers calls it, Mr. Lang refers to a miniature in the Bodleian Library, dated 1344, in which a woman is seen bowling to a man; but he adds, with characteristic humor, that the evidence of art is never very trustworthy, as the painter may have been a woman, or a monk, or an uneducated person! There is, however, very little doubt that the name was derived from the A. S. *cric*, a staff, corresponding to the French *crosse* used in the game of lacrosse. Although references to the game are not frequent in early literature, there is no doubt that it was permanently established as a national pastime many years before Pope thought it worthy of his satire. Writing in 1740, Lord Chesterfield says: "If you have a right ambition, you will desire to excel all boys of your age at cricket as well as learning"; and to a foreigner visiting England to-day the intense love of cricket which has been gaining strength through many generations will probably appear one of the marked social peculiarities of the people. An American, ignorant of this peculiarity of English life, will find it difficult to believe that only the other day an important debate in the House of Commons had to be postponed because a majority of the members were watching the Eton and Harrow match at Lord's!

There is an anecdote, well known to English Public School players of thirty years ago, which illustrates this somewhat comical exaltation of the national game. An old cricketer had two sons at Eton, and the great ambition of his life was that they should get into the school eleven. This was happily accomplished, and when the day came for the great annual match with Harrow, the old gentleman arrived early at Lord's ground, his heart full of exceeding great joy. Unfortunately Tom, the elder boy, was run out before he had had a chance to distinguish himself, and Archie, the younger, was bowled without making a run. In the evening, the old gentleman was found by a friend gloomily pacing to and fro in a remote corner of the ground, and the only explanation of his unhappiness he vouchsafed was, "Tom was unlucky, but d——n Archie!"

Mr. Lyttelton holds that there are three delightful moments in life connected with games: (1) Making chase one on the floor at tennis; (2) a successful drive at golf; (3) a crack to square leg off a half-volley just outside the legs—and those who understand these particlar sensations will be disposed to agree with him. But there are also plenty of unpleasant sensations in cricket. Take, for instance, Mr. Lyttelton's description of the pleasures of wicket-keeping:

> "There are several seconds, therefore, when the wicket-keeper is only conjecturing what course the ball is taking, and is certain of but two things—one, that the ball is hard; the other, that it is advancing in the direction of himself with terrific rapidity. Then, even if you see the ball plainly, it may happen to be, and frequently is, straight, and a straight fast ball raises unutterable emotions in the wicket-keeper's breast; for who knows what devilish tricks the ball, to say nothing of the bails, will play after the wicket is struck, and the course of the missile diverted, not stopped? The writer was once struck by the ball on the eye and by the bail on the mouth at very nearly the same second."

Nowadays cricket grounds are so true that a good deal of the danger is eliminated, but Mr. Lyttelton very truthfully remarks that long-stopping on Lord's ground in 1861 and 1862 was no laughing matter. There is on record a Public School match in the latter year in which the wicket-keeper was incapacitated early in the game by a blow on the head, and the unfortunate longstop looked—and felt—like a defeated prize-fighter, at the end of the second day. But in spite of these disagreeables there is undoubtedly a wonderful fascination in the game, not only for the players, but also for the lookers-on. True, the game loses much by the endless delays that seem inseparable from it, by the pokey play that has come into vogue with the modern slow-twisting bowling, and by the unsatisfactory state of the law in relation to *leg before wicket*. But though the important matches in England always last three days, and are very often unfinished at the end of the third day, owing to lack of time, the fact remains that ten or fifteen thousand people will pay to see the play each day. An American audience, accustomed to the rapid changes of base-ball, would regard such a performance in the same light as a Chinese drama which takes several weeks for its complete evolution; and yet, in Philadelphia, cricket, with certain American improvements—all in the direction of saving time—is unmistakably popular. This may be due either to climate or to some subtle similarity of temperament between the average Philadelphian and the average Englishman—a point which may be left to scientific investigation; but in spite of this fact it is extremely improbable that cricket will ever take the place of base-ball in this country.

Nor, on the whole, is it desirable that it should do so. At the great English Public Schools a natural turn for cricket in a boy is absolutely certain to result in a more or less serious impairment of his education; and when he comes to man's estate and realizes that there are more important things in the world than cricket, he finds it exceedingly difficult to make up for lost time. The fact is, that the time devoted to the game at these institutions is not in proportion to its value as an exercise, but to the national overestimate of its importance. The ever-increasing class of idle young Americans may well take to cricket, for it is not only admirable as a game, but is likely to develop many valuable moral as well as physical qualities; but those who have to make their way in the world cannot afford the loss of time involved in a thorough cricket training, and they are fortunate in having so good a substitute as base-ball.

There is much in this volume, however, that will interest any reader who cares for games, even though he be neither a Philadelphian nor a gentleman of leisure. Mr. Lang's chapters are not unworthy of his literary reputation, and the purely technical chapters on batting, bowling, etc., are, as a rule, well written. It is curious to note how a technical term will occasionally make a sentence unintelligible to the uninitiated, as, for instance, when Mr. Steel says: "Straight long hops do more to *get in the eyes* of batsmen than any other sort of ball."

The History of Protective Tariff Laws. By R. W. Thompson, ex-Secretary of the United States Navy. Chicago: R. S. Peale & Co. Pp. xii., 525. 8vo.

THIS book is not a history; it is a campaign shriek. Perhaps we should rather call it a long-drawn roar, for the intensity of a shriek cannot be kept up for 525 pages. Of intelligent historical investigation there is no trace. The author gives us abundance of quotations from the utterances of various public men, chiefly such as can be conveniently culled from the 'Statesman's Manual,' with occasional resort to the Congressional debates; at times we have a row of figures, such as may be got from the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury; but of original investigation, or even of pertinent information, there is not a particle. One could learn from the book the rate of duty on hardly a single article under any tariff act; there is no pretence of endeavor to trace out the effects of any duty.

The book, in fact, adds but another to the list of empty diatribes against British Free Trade. We are sorry to speak of it with contempt, for a careful specific discussion of the effect of duties, from a protectionist point of view, would deserve a respectful hearing. But what are we to say to an author who tells us, without further ado, that the "derangement of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business" in 1837-39 was due to the "threatened withdrawal of protection" under the Compromise Act of 1833?—who sagely remarks that "if revenue tariff could protect, it would be accidental, not incidental"? Mr. Thompson ascribes, in an off-hand way, the revival of trade in 1842 to the Tariff Act of that year. But in discussing the period between 1846 and 1857, he takes pains to show that prosperity was then due to other causes than the moderate duties. The idea that, when a protective tariff exists, other causes may also have an effect on general welfare, seems never to occur to him.

We are given several chapters on the Tariff Act of 1789, and there are lengthy extracts from the writings of Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Gallatin, and Jackson, all intended to show that these were indiscriminately in favor of protection. It is amusing to see Gallatin, the ablest of American statesmen in the advocacy of free trade, put side by side with Hamilton, the ablest of the protectionists. In contrast with this copiousness, we have hardly a word on the Tariff Act of 1828, the most striking and interesting of the earlier acts; which is the more peculiar, as this measure is generally cited by protectionists as a crowning example of beneficent tariff legislation. We may note by the way the extraordinary misstatement that Jackson's election in 1828 was due to his being *more* of an advocate of protection than Adams, and that the result of the campaign was, therefore, a vindication of the protective policy! We have the vaguest description of the acts of 1842, 1846, and 1857; there is bare mention of the Morrill tariff of 1861; and then the narrative, such as it is, stops abruptly. There is not a word on the history of the present tariff, or of the process by which the existing system has been built up since the civil war. After reaching the year 1860, we get nothing but half-a-dozen concluding chapters on the advantages of protection, on home markets, on the selfishness of England, and, of course, on the Cobden Club. It is delicious to be told that the Cobden Club is "a political organization which has become formidable in this country by the character and intelligence of its members. It has the centre of its operations in New York city (!), where it is mainly—as is believed [note the diplomatic caution of this qualification]—supported by the large body of importing merchants who there represent foreign capital and manufactures."

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the book is in the illustrations. These are diagrams scattered through the volume in the most inconsequential manner. Pink, yellow, and green circles and squares show "the world's manufactures"; "cereal products" (lovely rose-pink circles on a pale-green ground); the comparative wealth, income, and debt of various countries—in all of which the United States, of course, comes out first. These and other pictures are obviously supposed to convey their own meaning to the reader's mind, for there is not the slightest allusion to any of them in the text. Thus we have a diagram of the average yearly wages of artisans in the United States opposite a long and wearisome account of Jackson's attitude towards the nullification movement; another, of the value of farm lands, opposite a discussion of the advalorem duties of the act of 1846; while another, showing the receipts and expenditures for the year 1887, is sandwiched into the history of the tariff of 1824. This last is really a charming picture. The golden coins flow from green and yellow funnels, which are labelled "tariff," "internal revenue," "public lands," into a huge rosy coffer, well clamped and studded with nails, and marked "U. S. Treasury"; thence they go by rosy pipes into baskets, again green and yellow, labelled "War Dept.," "Navy," "Pensions," and so on. No one who sees this work of art can fail to be convinced of the beauties of the act of 1824 and of protective tariffs in general.

The Life of Dr. Anandibai Joshee. By Mrs. Caroline Healey Dall. Boston: Roberts Bros. 1888.

A PATHETIC interest must always attach to the story of the first Hindu woman to seek our shores for access to that learning which the institutions of her own country denied her, though they could not prevent her thirsting for it. Mental does not lag behind physical precocity in Hindu women, if we may judge by the two representatives they have sent to us—Ramabai and Dr. Joshee. It is not every sixteen-year-old girl, even if born to English speech, that could write such excellent English as we find in a letter of Anandibai's when at that age; and the sentiments she expresses in it are such as we get from too few older heads. For example (she was writing to her new-found American friend): "I love these Mission ladies for their enthusiasm and energy, but I dislike blindness to the feelings of others. . . . How arbitrary would it be if I were to say that all you believed was nonsense, and all I believed was just and proper! My dear friend, I have nothing to despise. The whole universe is a lesson to me. I am required by duty to respect every creed and sect, and value its religion." And when the daring purpose of sailing to America, to study medicine, was fully fixed in her mind, there is something to remind of Emerson in the language in which she announced it: "My design meets with the approbation of a few, say one or two to a thousand, and they are probably youths, reformers, and patriots. I am not discouraged. I must not fear, but try my best and show all what we Indian ladies are like. Our antient Indian ladies were very wise, brave, courageous, and benevolent, and endurance was their badge. Let it be my badge also."

This book tells of her coming to our country, of her study and graduation at the Woman's Medical College at Philadelphia, of her broken health (it would seem that her medical friends were unaccountably inattentive to her marked symptoms of consumption), of her return to India, and of her death, not yet twenty-two, before she had done a stroke of that work for Hindu women to which she had determined to devote her life. The narrative is a brief and fragmentary one, but it reveals a strong and singularly noble soul. Dr. Joshee's wonderful mental poise appears in many ways, in none more than in her steadfast refusal to gratify those American friends who were fondly counting upon her "conversion." She welcomed all that Christianity had for her, and maintained that her way of looking at religion embraced whatever was of value in either Christianity or Hinduism; he would be bold who should say she was wrong.

The editing is not without faults. The reader has too much gratuitous information thrust upon him, and finds all too frequent finger-boards pointing out the proper places for him to bestow his admiration. Most serious defect of all, the treatment accorded Dr. Joshee's husband is extremely unfair. He is pictured in a wholly unpleasant light, and yet no proof is supplied that the characterization is just. He may have been all that he is said or hinted to be, but the reader is not shown the evidence. Where are Anandibai's letters to him—his to her? How much was he consulted in the writing of this memoir? With such questions must one who would not condemn a man unheard turn from the reading of this book.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Franklin, B. Complete Works, edited by John Bigelow. Vol. 9. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $5.
Gillig, C. A. Guide to London. 8th ed. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co. 50 cents.
Goss, Prof. W. F. M. Bench Work in Wood. Boston: Ginn & Co. 75 cents.
Hale, Prof. W. G. Aims and Methods in Classical Study. Boston: Ginn & Co. 20 cents.
Hale, Rev. E. E. How They Lived in Hampton. Boston: J. Stilman Smith & Co.
Holder, C. F. A Strange Company: Wonder-wings, Mullingongs, Colossi, etc. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.25.
Hopkins, S. R. A Young Prince of Commerce. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.25.
Howard, Blanche Willis. Aulnay Tower. Boston: Ticknor & Co. 50 cents.
Howells, W. D. A Sea-Change, or Love's Stowaway. Boston: Ticknor & Co. $1.
La Motte Fouqué, F. de. Undine; and Sintram and His Companions. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.
Lavisse, Prof. E. Trois Empereurs de l'Allemagne. Paris: Armand Colin & Cie.; New York: F. W. Christern.
Linton, Mrs. E. Lynn. Through the Lone Nights. Harper & Bros. 25 cents.
Loti, P. An Icelandic Fisherman. Wm. S. Gottsberger.
MacDonald, G. The Elect Lady. D. Appleton & Co. 50 cents.
Maudsley, A. Highways and Horses. London: Chapman & Hall; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.
McClelland, M. G. Madame Silva. Cassell & Co. 25 cents.
Merrill, S. Newspaper Libel: a Handbook for the Press. Boston: Ticknor & Co.
Morley, Prof. H. English Writers: III. From the Conquest to Chaucer. Cassell & Co. $1.50.
My Aunt's Matchmaking. Cassell & Co.
Ninette: an Idyl of Provence. D. Appleton & Co. 50 cents.
Our Young Folks at Home. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.
Packard, Prof. A. S. Entomology for Beginners. Henry Holt & Co.
Parker, Prof. H. W. The Spirit of Beauty. John B. Alden. 75 cents.
Payne, J. The Eavesdropper. Harper & Bros. 25 cents.
Pearson, F. W. An Idyl of Bar Harbor: a Poem. New York: The Welles Publishing Co. 10c.
Perrin, W. H. The Pioneer Press of Kentucky. Louisville: John P. Morton & Co. $1.50.
Philip Earnscliffe, or the Morals of May Fair. G. W. Dillingham.

"Every child in America should have them."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia' should be in every juvenile library."—*From a Report of the Connecticut Board of Education.*

YOUNG FOLKS' { *Common Things...$2.50.* / *Persons and Places..$2.50* } *of CYCLOPÆDIA*

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers, New York.

Germany.

PROF. A. FLEISCHMANN, *Eldena, Pommern.* Thorough study of German, etc. Summer resort for sea-bathing. Fine surroundings. Isle of Rügen, University of Greifswald. For circulars address Prof. J. M. Crow, Ph.D., Grinnell, Iowa, or Prof. A. Fleischmann.

LIBRARY-GIVERS

Public Library or College Trustees

—anybody having occasion to make collections of books—can sift the book world at home and abroad for its best, make money go its furthest, and be relieved of all detail, through the undersigned (of the late firm Lockwood, Brooks & Co., Boston), 25 years in the trade with every advantage.

J. S. LOCKWOOD,
82 Equitable Building, Boston.

AUTHORS, Writers, Professionals, Amateurs.—Manuscript wanted; send stamp for prospectus. AUTHORS' EXCHANGE, 335 Broadway.

B. WESTERMANN & CO.,

838 Broadway, New York,

Foreign Booksellers and Importers.

School and Text-books, foreign and American. *Teubner's* Greek and Latin Series.

THIEME-PREUSSER, German-Engl. Dictionary. $4.25.

BRUGMANN. Comparative Grammar. $5 net.

Catalogues on application.

BABYHOOD.—Devoted to the care of Infants. $1.50 a year. 5 Beekman St., New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scribner & Welford's

LIST OF BOOKS

Suitable for Use in High-Class Schools, Colleges, and Ladies' Schools.

An Elementary History of Art.

By N. D'Anvers. With a Preface by Prof. Roger Smith. An entirely new and enlarged edition in 2 vols. Vol. i, Architecture and Sculpture. Vol. ii, Painting, with 360 illustrations. Large crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top.

For students who desire thus to train their own minds, for those who wish to prepare themselves for Continental travel, and, above all, for pupils in schools of a high class, no handbook of Art History could be more suitable than this work.

Biographies of the Great Musicians.

Specially prepared for Schools, Amateurs, and Students of Music. Each volume strongly bound in decorated cloth. Price, per volume, $1. Including,

Haydn, Handel, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Purcell, Bach, Weber, Mendelssohn, Wagner, Rossini, English Church Composers.

Art Hand-Books.

A new series of Illustrated Text-Books of Art Education. Edited by E. J. Poynter, R.A. Each volume contains numerous illustrations, and is strongly bound for the use of students. Price, per volume, $2.

I. PAINTING. Classic and Italian. By E. J. Poynter and P. R. Head.

II. —— German, Flemish, and Dutch. By H. W. Buxton.

III. —— English and American. By H. W. Buxton.

IV. —— French and Spanish. By G. Smith.

V. ARCHITECTURE. Classic and Early Christian. By T. R. Smith.

VI. —— Gothic and Renaissance. By T. R. Smith.

VII. SCULPTURE. Antique, Egyptian, and Greek. By G. Redford.

VIII. —— Renaissance and Modern. By G. Redford.

Biographies of the Great Artists.

Specially prepared for Schools, Amateurs, and Students of Art. Each volume contains about 16 illustrations, including a portrait of the master, and is strongly bound in decorated cloth. Price, per volume, $1.25, unless marked otherwise, viz.:

REYNOLDS — HOGARTH — GAINSBOROUGH AND CONSTABLE — LAWRENCE AND ROMNEY, $1.00—TURNER—WILKIE—LANDSEER—GIOTTO—FRA ANGELICO—FRA BARTOLOMMEO—GHIBERTI AND DONATELLO, $1.00—MANTEGNA—LEONARDO DA VINCI—MICHEL ANGELO—RAPHAEL—TITIAN—TINTORETTO—CORREGGIO, $1.00 — VELASQUEZ—MURILLO, $1.00—ALBRECHT DURER—THE LITTLE MASTERS—HOLBEIN—OVERBECK — REMBRANDT—RUBENS—VAN DYCK—DELLA ROBBIA, $1.00—WATTEAU, $1.00—VERNET—FIGURE PAINTERS OF HOLLAND—MEISSONIER, $1.00—CLAUDE.

Complete detailed list supplied.

"The respectable and sometimes excellent translations of Bohn's Library have done for Literature what railroads have done for internal intercourse."—R. W. Emerson.

"I may say in regard to all manner of books, Bohn's Publication Series is the usefullest thing I know."—Thomas Carlyle.

"An important body of cheap literature, for which every living worker in this country who draws strength from the past has reason to be grateful."—Professor Henry Morley.

"The publishers are making constant additions, of an eminently acceptable character, to 'Bohn's Libraries.'"—Athenæum.

Bohn's Libraries.

CONTAINING

STANDARD WORKS of EUROPEAN LITERATURE in the ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

With Dictionaries and other Books of Reference.

Comprising in all translations from the French, German, Italian, Spanish, Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon, Latin, and Greek,

700 Volumes, $1.40 or $2 each, with exceptions.

RECENT ADDITIONS.

VICTOR HUGO'S DRAMATIC WORKS. HERNANI—RUY BLAS—THE KING'S DIVERSION. Translated by Mrs. Newton Crosland and F. L. Slous. $1.40.

THE LETTERS AND WORKS OF LADY MARY WORTLEY MONTAGU. Edited by her great-grandson, Lord Wharncliffe; with additions and corrections derived from original MSS., Illustrative Notes, and a Memoir by W. Moy Thomas. New Edition, Revised, in Two Vols., with Portraits. $4.

"A most convenient reprint of Mr. Moy Thomas's admirable edition."—*Athenæum*

AN EGYPTIAN PRINCESS. An Historical Novel. By Georg Ebers. Translated by Emma S. Buchheim. $1.40.

"The translator's rendering is easy and elegant."—*Morning Post.*

ADAM SMITH'S THE WEALTH OF NATIONS. An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of. Reprinted from the Sixth Edition. With an Introduction by Ernest Belfort Bax. Two vols., $4.

SENECA (L. ANNÆUS) ON BENEFITS. Addressed to Æbutius Liberalis. Translated by Aubrey Stewart, M.A. $1.40.

"This is a faithful rendering of the 'De Beneficiis' in plain but Academic English."—*St. James's Gazette.*

RANKE'S HISTORY OF THE LATIN AND TEUTONIC NATIONS. Translated by P. A. Ashworth. $1.40.

HEINE'S TRAVEL-PICTURES. Translated by Francis Storr. $1.40.

"Mr. Storr's brilliant version."—*Academy.*

GOETHE'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH ZELTER. Selected, Translated, and Edited by A. D. Coleridge, M.A. $1.40.

THE STUDENT'S HANDBOOK OF HISTORICAL GEOLOGY. By A. J. Jukes-Browne, B.A., F.G.S. $2.40.

PAUSANIAS'S DESCRIPTION OF GREECE. Translated by A. R. Shilleto, M.A. 2 vols. $4.

HOFFMANN'S TALES. The Serapion Brethren. First Portion. Translated by Lieut.-Col. A. Ewing. $1.40.

HAUFF'S TALES. The Caravan—The Sheik of Alexandria—The Inn in the Spessart. Translated by S. Mendel. $1.40.

GOLDSMITH'S WORKS. A New Edition. By J. W. M. Gibbs. 5 vols. $7.

A SELECTION.

ANTONINUS.—THE THOUGHTS OF M. AULIURES $1.40.
ADDISON'S WORKS. 6 vols. $8.
BAX'S MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. $2.
BOSWELL'S LIFE OF JOHNSON (Centenary Edition, edited by Napier). 6 vols. $8.40.
COLERIDGE'S WORKS. 6 vols. $8.40.
FAIRHOLT'S COSTUME IN ENGLAND (Dillon). 2 vols. $4.
LESSING'S LAOKOON. Translated.
LESSING'S DRAMATIC WORKS. 2 vols. Translated.
MILTON'S PROSE WORKS. 5 vols.
MOLIERE'S DRAMATIC WORKS. 2 vols. Translated. $4.20.
PEPYS'S DIARY. 4 vols. $8.
PLUTARCH'S LIVES. 4 vols. (Stewart & Long's trans.) $5.60.
SPINOZA'S CHIEF WORKS. Translated. 2 vols. $4.
STAUNTON'S CHESS HANDBOOK. $2.

*** *The above books sent upon receipt of advertised price. Catalogues of our regular stock, also complete lists of Bohn's Libraries, will be mailed, if desired, to those interested.*

SCRIBNER & WELFORD, 743–745 BROADWAY, N. Y.

"A Number which will interest everybody."

Scribner's Magazine

FOR SEPTEMBER.

CONTENTS:

"SHOW YOUR TICKETS!" PASSENGER STATION, PHILADELPHIA. *Frontispiece.* From a drawing by Walter Shirlaw.

RAILWAY PASSENGER TRAVEL. By GENERAL HORACE PORTER. Being the fourth paper in the RAILWAY SERIES. Describing the comforts and luxuries of modern travel, with illustrations from drawings by R. Blum, F. C. Jones, Charles Broughton, J. D. Woodward, and others.

Former papers in the Railway Series are:

"*THE BUILDING OF A RAILWAY*," by Thomas Curtis Clarke. 36 illustrations. (June.)

"*FEATS OF RAILWAY ENGINEERING*," by John Bogart. 35 illustrations. (July.)

"*AMERICAN LOCOMOTIVES AND CARS*," by M. N. Forney. 48 illustrations. (August.)

MEMORIES OF SOME CONTEMPORARIES. By HON. HUGH MCCULLOCH, *ex-Secretary of the Treasury.* Mr. McCulloch, after a public life of half a century, records his impressions of famous men, among them Henry Ward Beecher, Thomas P. Marshall, ex-Presidents Lincoln, Johnson, Grant, and Arthur, Generals McClellan, Hancock, Sheridan, Sherman, Thomas, and many others.

SCENES IN CYPRUS. By W. H. MALLOCK, author of 'The New Republic,' 'Is Life Worth Living?' etc. With illustrations from photographs taken by Mr. Mallock during his journey.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN MEDALS. By GUSTAV KOBBÉ. A timely and most interesting paper. With many illustrations from pieces in the cabinets of Robert Hewitt, William Poillon, and the American Numismatic and Archæological Society of New York.

THE MODERN GREEKS. By THOMAS D. SEYMOUR. With illustrations from drawings by F. D. Millet and Kenyon Cox, and from a painting from E. H. Blashfield.

A LETTER TO A YOUNG GENTLEMAN WHO PROPOSES TO EMBRACE THE CAREER OF ART. By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON.

A LETTER TO THE SAME YOUNG GENTLEMAN. By WILL H. LOW.

"*A SECOND-HAND STORY.*" A charming short story. By H. C. BUNNER.

A LONDON LIFE. By HENRY JAMES. Concluded in this number.

POEMS.

THE LOST FRIEND. By NORA PERRY.

SILVER AND GOLD. By EDITH M. THOMAS.

A JAR OF ROSE LEAVES. By THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.

A SUMMER EVENING. By JAMES HERBERT MORSE.

FUJI: THE SACRED MOUNTAIN. By PERCIVAL LOWELL. With an illustration from a painting by J. H. Twachtman, engraved by Elbridge Kingsley.

25 Cents a Number. $3.00 a Year.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743 Broadway, New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED